

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

APRIL 1909.

ARGOS IN HOMER.

THIS paper is an attempt to elucidate the senses in which this place-name is used in Homer; to assign meanings to the Homeric terms Achaean, Iason and Pelasgic Arge, to 'Argive' as a synonym for Greek, and to establish the nature of the Argos over which Agamemnon ruled. I take the Homeric poems as the unity which they profess to be, and which they must be for historical enquiry. Whatever liberties Homer took with his materials (and I credit him with as free a hand as any one has allowed to Pisistratus) it is plain he was careful to respect events. The effort to distinguish between old and new in the Iliad and Odyssey has caused needless and fruitless encumbrance to the official historians, such as Busolt; the unitarian position has given us the remarkable results of Professor Myres' paper on the Pelasgians, *J.H.S.* 1907, 170 sqq.). The consistency of Mr. Myres' account, and I venture to hope of mine, allows a fresh inference back to the homogeneity of the poems which are their source.

I.

It may be useful in the first place to collect the views of the meaning of *ἄργος* current in later Greece. Strabo 372, after an enumeration of the various cases of Argos, says *ἄργος δὲ καὶ τὸ τεῖλον λέγεται παρὰ τοῖς νεωτέροις, παρ' Ουκήρῳ δὲ οὐδὲ ἀπαξ μάλιστα δὲ οἴνοται Μακεδονικὸν καὶ Θετταλικὸν εἶναι*. The latter remark seems an inference from the Δάτιον and 'Ορεστικὸν *ἄργος* where there were no towns, and therefore the word must mean a district. It is true that no case of *ἄργος* as a common noun is found in Homer (unless indeed it is necessary so to take δ 174 sqq., see p. 94), but that the various proper names *"Ἄργος"* take their origin from the common noun there is no reason to doubt; every Argos in historical use in Greece is either a valley or a town in one: and there are many parallels, e.g. in Greece *"Ἐλος," "Ηλις,"*

NO. X. VOL. III.

F

Holland in England and in the Netherlands; Piemonte, and Piano the name of more than one Italian village (e.g. Piano dei Giullari near Florence). Stephanus of Byzantium in voc. says ἄργος δὲ σχέδιον πᾶν πεδίον κατὰ θάλασσαν; Stephanus' and Strabo's statement is confirmed by one literary text, a line quoted by the same Stephanus in v. Δάστιον from a poet Dionysius:¹

καὶ κενὸν κρότησε [sic] λέβηη ἀνὰ Δάστιον ἄργος.

We obtain the equation ἀνὰ Δάστιον ἄργος = Δάστιον ἐν πεδίῳ of Hesiod *fr. 122*, 246, h. Hom. xvi. 3, and Δάστια τέμπεα of the same Dionysius in his first book (*ib.*). The valley itself was also known as Ἄμυρικὸν πεδίον from the river which watered it (*Polib. v. 97*). It had no connection with the sea, and therefore does not bear out Stephanus' limitation, which however is true of Argolis, the Amphilochic and the Pelasgic Arge, and may be of the Orestic. The last is with equal probability the delta of the Haliacmon or some open spot higher up its valley.²

These are the cases of the word used as a common noun which can be proved. We must next notice the theory, a doctrine of the antiquaries, that Argos *tout court* meant the Peloponnese, while Argos Iason and Argos Achaicum also meant the Peloponnese and Argos Pelasgicum meant Thessaly. We find this explicitly in *Apollodorus* (*Bibl. ii. 3*) "Ἄργος δὲ λαβὼν τὴν βιστίειαν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ τὴν Πελοπόννησον ἐκάλεσεν" *"Ἀργος.* id. ap. Steph. Byz. in *"Ἀργούρα.* — Απολόδωρος δὲ φησιν ἐν πρώτῳ νεῶν καταλόγῳ Ἀργείους ὄνυμάζεσθαι ή τῆς προσηγορίας μεταπεσούσης ή διὰ τὸ προσκυροῦ τὰ πεδία τῆς Θετταλίας, ην δὲ Πελασγικὸν *"Ἀργος εἶπεν Ομηρος* and in *Strabo* (370 ἀλλως τε οὐ τὴν πόλιν λέγει τὸ *"Ἀργος,* οὐ γάρ ἐκεῖσται ἐμελλεν ἀφίσθειαι, ἀλλὰ τὴν Πελοπόννησον.

371 ὅτι δ' *"Ἀργος τὴν Πελοπόννησον λέγει προσλαβεῖν ἔστι καὶ τάδε *"Ἀργείη δ' Ἐλένη,* καὶ, ἔστι πόλις *"Ἐφύρη μυχῷ* *"Ἀργεος,* καὶ, μέσον *"Ἀργος,* καὶ, πολλῆσιν νήσοισι καὶ *"Ἀργει* πατρὶ ἀνάστοιν. Cf. also 363 *"Ἀχαιοὶ γύρῳ τούς Φθιώτας φασὶ συγκατελθόντας Πέλοποι εἰς τὴν Πελοπόννησον οἰκήσαι τὴν Δικωνικήν, τοσοῦτοι δ' ἀρετῇ διενεγκεῖν ὥστε τὴν Πελοπόννησον ἐκ πολλῶν ἥδη χρόνων *"Ἀργος λεγούμενην,* τότε *"Ἀλαικὸν* *"Ἀργος λεχθῆναι;* and his most general statement 369 καὶ πρῶτον ποσαχός λέγεται παρὰ τῷ ποιητῷ τὸ *"Ἀργος καὶ καθ' αὐτὸν καὶ μετὰ τοῦ ἐπιθέτου,* *"Ἀχαιοὶ* *"Ἀργος καλοῦντος ή* *"Ιασον* ή *ππιον* ή *Πελασγικὸν* ή *ιππιόβοτον.* καὶ γὰρ ή πόλις *"Ἀργος λέγεται*—καὶ ή *Πελοπόννησος***

ἥμετέρῳ ἐνὶ οἰκῳ ἐν *"Ἀργεῖ*

οὐ γάρ ή πόλις γε ήν οἰκος αὐτοῦ καὶ δηλ ή *"Ἐλλάς*—τὴν δ' οὖν ὄμωνυμίαν τοῖς ἐπιθέτοις διαστέλλεται, τὴν μὲν Θετταλίαν Πελασγικὸν *"Ἀργος καλῶν*

νῦν αὖ τοὺς ὅσσοις τὸ Πελασγικὸν *"Ἀργος* ἔναιον,

τὴν δὲ Πελοπόννησον *"Ἀχαιοὶ*—*"Ιασον* τε *"Ἀργος τὴν Πελοπόννησον λέγει* 221 καὶ τὸ Πελασγικὸν *"Ἀργος Θετταλία λέγεται,* τὸ μεταξὺ τῶν ἐκβολῶν τοῦ

¹ His poem, the Γυγατίς, is also cited by Stephanus in Κελαδών, Νέστων, Ορέσται, Τιτων and consisted of at least three books. His date is unknown, but he or his predecessors represent Strabo's *νεώτερος.*

² The ἄργος νεώτερος under Mt. Alesion in Arcadia (Paus. viii. 7. 1) which resembles in situation the Dotian Argos is no doubt only an apparent coincidence.

Πηρειοῦ καὶ τῶν τόπων τοῦ
*Ἀργος τὸ Ιασονίου οὐδὲν ποτε
οὔτως ὄνοματι
σαντος. 371
δόξα τῆς πόλεως
οὔτω δὲ καὶ τὸ
wont, endeav-
Homer, and
must have been
from *Acusilaus*
Πελασγικὸν,
in the imme-
in this sense
has the four
mentions *Ιστορία*
fr. 26 says
a v.l., *eis* Δά-
as far as Ph-

The inter-
doubt very
Homeric epo-
to fit them-
claim on wh-
of Phthia
Dicaearchus,
Agamemnon
forbade the
neighbour A-
attacked, bu-
their ill-suc-
something t-
land poet
equipped w-
10568 v. 5

The editor
significance

And put the
Inachus, e.g. in
³ There is n-

Πηρειοῦ καὶ τῶν Θερμοπυλῶν ἔως τῆς ὁρευῆς τῆς κατὰ Πύνδον, διὰ τὸ ἐπάρξαι τὸν τόπων τούτων τὸν Πελασγούς [this clearly is from Ephorus]; 431 τὸ τε Ἀργος τὸ Πελασγικὸν οἱ μὲν καὶ πόλιν δέχονται Θετταλικὴν περὶ Δάρισαν ἴδρυμένην ποτὲ τὸν δὲ οὐκέτι οὐδαν' οἱ δὲ οὐ πόλιν ἀλλὰ τὸ τῶν Θετταλῶν πεδίον οὔτως ὄνοματικὸς λεγούμενον, θεμένον τούτομα Ἀβαντος ἐξ Ἀργον δὲν' ἀποκήσαντος. 371 οἷμα δὲ ὅτι καὶ Πελασγιώτας καὶ Δαναοίς, ὥσπερ καὶ Ἀργείον, η δόξα τῆς πόλεως τάντης ἀπ' αὐτῆς καὶ τοῖς ἀλλοῖς Ἑλληνας καλείσθαι παρεσκεύασεν οὕτον δὲ καὶ Ἰασίδας καὶ Ἰασονὸς Ἀργος. We see Strabo, according to his honest wont, endeavouring to support the doctrine he has received by the usage of Homer, and making that usage as consistent as may be). The doctrine itself must have been much older; the statement in Apollodorus ii. 3 seems to come from Acusilaus and besides that in Strabo 221 the argument for making Πελασγικὸν Ἀργος a name of Thessaly is taken from Ephorus, who is quoted in the immediate neighbourhood, the name 'Pelasgic' without the word 'argos' in this sense is common among the 5th century logographers: Hellanicus fr. 28 has the four divisions of Thessaly, of which Πελασγιῶτις is one (Herodotus i. 56 mentions Ἰστιαῖωτις); Hecataeus fr. 334 calls Thessaly Πελασγία; Pherecydes fr. 26 says Acrisius retreated εἰς τὸν Πελασγούν εἰς Δάρισταν, or according to a v.l., εἰς Δάρισταν τὴν Πελασγικὴν. Acusilaus fr. 11 states that Peloponnesus as far as Pharsalia (μέχρι Φαρσαλίας Τρετές) and Larissa Πελασγία ἐκλήθη.

The interpretations thus placed upon heroic and prae-heroic names are no doubt very ancient; there is nothing to prevent them hailing from early post-Homeric epos. They represent as a whole the efforts of the Dorian peoples to fit themselves into the heroic age. Strabo 431 has given us the detailed claim on which the Pharsalians (unknown to Homer) relied for the possession of Phthia and Hellas (a claim admitted by the Peripatetic antiquarian Dicaearchus, *Geog. min.* p. 109); the Heraclid Argives of Argolis took Agamemnon to their king,¹ with such success that the potente of Sicyon forbade the recitation of Homer on the ground that the poet exalted his neighbour Argos;² the Megarians, like the Pharsalians, non-existent in Homer, attacked, but in vain, the Catalogue. The Ἰωνικὸς ποιητὰς repelled them, and their ill-success suggests that the Sons of Homer in early days could do something to defend their father. They found less resistance in Hesiod; the land poet was more amenable than the Chian, and they are duly seated, equipped with their heroic epithet, among Ajax' possessions in *PaP. Berl.* 10568 v. 5 καὶ Μέγαρα σκιόεντα καὶ ὄφροσέντα Κόρινθον.

The editors (*Berliner Klassikertexte* v. i. 1907) have hardly appreciated the significance of this portion of Hesiod. When the poet says

Αἴτας δὲ ἐκ Σαλαμείνος ἀμώμητος πολεμιστής
μάτω δίδου δέ ἄρα ἔδνα ἐοικότα, θαυματὰ ἔργα·

And put three of the Pelopidae into the line of If Inachus, e.g. in Tatian's genealogy, *adv. Graecos* c. 39.

¹ *Hom. Unt.* 352 that Clisthenes was jealous of the Θεβαῖς, where there was no King of Men and the rôle of Argos was not over-glorious.

² There is no need to assume with Wilamowitz

οὐ γάρ ἔχον Τροιέντα καὶ ἀγχίαλον Ἐπίδαυρον
νῆσόν τ' Ἀγεναν Μάστητά τε κούροι Ἀχαιῶν,
καὶ Μέγαρα σκιώεντα καὶ ὄφριώεντα Κόρυθον,
Ἐρμιόνην Ἀσίνην τε παρὲξ ἀλλα ναιετάστας,
τῶν ἔφατ' εἰδίποδις τε βόας καὶ ἵψια μῆλα
συνελάσας δώσειν, ἐκέαστο γάρ ἔγχει μακρῷ—

he has given the Megarians what they¹ in vain sought from Homer, an heroic existence under the banner of Ajax. To glorify Ajax's state the complaisant Hesiodean enriched him at the expense of his compeers; Troezen, Epidaurus, Aegina, Mases, Hermione and Asine are taken from the kingdom of Argolis; Corinth is filched from the King of Men. At what period in Megarian history claims of this magnitude were made concerns the professionals; in any case it happened before Pisistratus' day. But these variants, where the general motive is so plain, the Berlin editors say 'sind schwerlich beabsichtigte Aenderungen, sondern unserer Ueberlieferung gleichwertig.' It was simple to expect (p. 38) 'in den hesioidischen Katalogen die echte Fassung des homerischen benutzt zu finden.' Rather we now see the origin of the variant *νῆσόν τ' Αἴγυναν* which Strabo notes 'some' wished to get into B 562, of the version of the whole passage in the *Certamen* 278, and of part of the oracle infra. On the other hand the editors need not postdate their fragment—which they bring down later than Pisistratus. Surely even the Hesiodic well had dried by the end of the sixth century; and what had become of the ambitions of Megara? The legend that the Homeric Catalogue 'assumed its present form' under Pisistratus, or generally that Homer suffered editing at the hands of Pisistratus or the Athenians, dies hard. Mr. Verrall has breathed some life into it in a genial article in the July number of the *Quarterly Review* for 1908, and captive made of Mr. Murray (*Anthropology and the Classics*, p. 68). The arguments for the substantial canonicity of the Iliad and Odyssey as early as about 800 B.C. are briefly these: (1) the existence of the Cycle, which presupposes the Iliad and the Odyssey, of the compass in which we have them, two centuries before Pisistratus. The dates of the Cycle are unimpugned, and rest on evidence which compared to Mr. Verrall's 'record' of the Athenian Reformation is scientific. (2) The appeals made to the *Catalogue* as a title in international matters, first in Pisistratus' own century. Athenians could not have produced a document which they had altered in their own interest. We may add that the intelligence of the sixth century was not so low as to overlook and forgive a forgery. We have the case of Onomacritus. (3) The insignificant part given to Athens in the poems. There are signs indeed of a more local Athenian version, but it did not affect the vulgate. No nation guilty of 'editing' could have produced so poor a result. (4) The *ex parte* origin of the whole story, Megara (I need not give the references).¹ As Megara ascribed its non-existence in Homer to the machinations of its enemy, so the Sicyonians,

¹ See *C.R.* 1907, 18.

eager like the Δονέσσα the by Pisistratus As Athenians (Paus. vii. 26) Athenians for poet, that and Mr. Ver and of exte curricular re The New M the Persians orator Lycus Athenians s should be re more produc by Dr. E. H worked ther

The mo two²: (1) authority of in 'Yueis on and Ion (ib

Dinias the asserted the it seems to mitted their heroic age.

¹ The Megar fact; the later M been in the he Elean coast w prejudice the e island and his u ally, unimportat archipelago and at twelve ships.

eager like their king to protest against the predominance of Argos, said Δονόεσσα the coast-town (outside historical Sicyonian territory) had been altered by Pisistratus to Γονόεσσα, a village near the Argive border (*ὑπὲρ Σικυῶνος* Paus.). As Athenian interests were not concerned, the mistake was made *ὑπὲρ ἀγνοίας* (Paus. vii. 26); the Megarians had imputed mala fides.¹ This reward had the Athenians for the religious scruple with which they treated the international poet, that antiquity accused them of tampering with the title of their neighbours, and Mr. Verrall has detected a great scheme of harmonisation within the poems, and of external adaptation and combination of them into a cycle, to suit the curricular regeneration of the Athenian race. The Privatdozent won at Sedan, the New Model at Naseby, and the Wooden Horse in his due place repelled the Persians. The readers of the *Quarterly* should know that the way the orator Lycurgus, our only authority, puts this great movement is that 'the Athenians so esteemed this poet that they ordered his works and his only should be recited every five years at the Panathenaea.' Mr. Verrall would find a better period for his constructions in the age of the great rhapsodes, and a more productive hero in Lycurgus, whose existence has been recently vindicated by Dr. E. Reich. The sutures in the Iliad are there, but no Athenian needle worked them.

The mentions of the term Πελασγικὸν Ἀργος in independent literature are two:² (1) the oracle (Hendess 178) given in Schol. Theocr. xiv. 48 on the authority of Dinius (εἰ 'Αργολικός, *F.H.G.* iii. 25) and by Photius and Suidas in Υμεῖς on that of Mnaseas of Patara (*Δελφικὸν χρηστῶν συναγωγή* *F.H.G.* iii. 149) and Ion (*ib.* ii. 51). Variants apart it runs

Γάιης μὲν πάσης τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἀργος ἀμεινον,
ἀνδρες δὲ οἱ πίνουσιν ὑδάρι καλής Ἀρεθούσης.
ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ τῶν εἰσὶν ἀμείνονες οἱ τὸ μεσηγύ
Τίρυνθος ναίνονται καὶ Ἀρκαδίης πολυμιλον,
5 'Αργεῖοι λινοθώρηκες κέντρα πτολέμοιο.
 ἴμεις δὲ ὁ Μεγαρεῖς οὔτε τρίτοι οὔτε τέταρτοι,
 οὔτε διωδέκατοι, οὔτ' ἐν λόγῳ οὔτ' ἐν ἀριθμῷ.

Dinius the Argive antiquarian read Μεγαρεῖς in v. 6, whereas Ion and Mnaseas asserted the oracle was given to the inhabitants of Aegium. In Dinius' version it seems to chronicle a case of the same ambition of the Megarians which permitted their antiquarians, Hereas and Dieuchidas, their efforts to get into the heroic age. The oracle is late and its sources rather Hesiodic than Homeric;

¹ The Megarian claim may have had some basis in fact; the later Megara, nameless in Homer, may have been in the heroic age the *περάλη* of Salamis, as the Elean coast was of Ithaca. This however does not prejudice the entry in the *Catalogue*: Ajax with his island and his unnamed *περάλη* was important personally, unimportant politically, like Odysseus with his archipelago and his *περάες*. Both heroes were rated at twelve ships, the Athenians sent fifty; they were a

maritime power. The moderns wish to see Megara in Νίσα (B 508): this had not occurred to Hereas and Dieuchidas, and whatever effect the hexameter may have had in spacing places in the *Catalogue*, Anthedon is a very long way from Megara.

² My excuse for this detail is that none of the following passages are given in Smith or in Pauly-Wissowa.

the Pelasgic Argos no doubt is given its antiquarian sense. Still the argos as a proverb for fertility may have started in Malis; the Echinae according to Polybius ix. 41. 11 καρποῦνται γῆν πάυσφορον. Zenodotus' reading B681 is in the same sense. (2) Suidas in v. Ἀργόλαι tells this story: εἶδος δέρεων, οὐς ἤνεγκε Μακεδὼν Ἀλέξανδρος ἐκ τοῦ Ἀργού τοῦ Πελασγικοῦ εἰς Ἀλεξανδρειαν, καὶ ἐνίβαλεν εἰς τὸν ποταμὸν πρὸς ἀνάρεστον τῶν ἀσπίδων, ὅπει μετέθηκε τὸ ὄστρα Τερεμίου τοῦ προφίτου ἐξ Αἰγύπτου εἰς Ἀλεξανδρειαν οὐς ὁ αὐτὸς προφήτης ἀπέκτενεν. Ἀργόλαι οὖν, ἐκ τοῦ Ἀργού λαοί. The source of this history is obscure; in another version it is found in the *Chronicon Paschale* c. 156 (Migne, *Patrol.* 92 p. 383) where instead of Πελασγικοῦ we find Πελοποννησιακοῦ. Moschus, *Pratum Spirituale* c. 77 (Migne, vol. 87 pt. 3) has a story of the translation of Jeremy's bones by Alexander, but nothing about serpents or Ἀργος. (I owe these two references to the kindness of the Rev. F. E. Brightman.) The work quoted in the notes to Suidas (*Hierozoicon, sive bipartitum opus de animalibus sacrae scripturae auctore Samuele Bocharto, Londini 1663* p. 449) sends me to Aristotle, περὶ θαυμαστῶν ἴκονων μάρτιών, who has an Argive locust, (ἐν Ἀργείᾳ ἀκρίδας) which fights scorpions, and an *ιερὸς ὄφης* in Thessaly which is death to mankind and reptiles alike (844 b 139, 845 b 151). Argos and Thessaly seem to correspond to the Peloponnesian and Pelasgic Argos of the ecclesiastical writers. Or, what is as likely and as immaterial, Suidas' source may have followed Euripides, who *Orestes* 1276 has Πελασγὸν Ἀργος simply in the sense of Argolis.

There is therefore no evidence that the term Πελασγικὸν Ἀργος was a real place-name in historical Greece. It was used by the learned in the sense which tradition gave to Homer's expression B681.

About the etymology nothing is known. The connection with 'white' disproves itself. Plains near the sea usually and waterlogged valleys always are green.

II.

When we turn from posthomeric doctrine to the usage of the Iliad and Odyssey it will be convenient to deal with the specific cases first and Argos in general afterwards. The specific cases are Ἀχαιικόν, Ιασον and Πελασγικόν. The Achaean again comes naturally with Agamemnon's Argos.

Ιασον Ἀργος is mentioned once; σ 245 Eurymachus pays Penelope a compliment;

κούρη Ἰκαρίοιο περίφρον Πηνελοπεῖη,
εἰ πάντες σε ἰδοεν ἀν' Ιασον Ἀργος Ἀχαιοί,
πλέονές κε μηρτῆρες ἐν ὑμετέροισι δόμοισι
ἡῶθεν δαινάτ', ἐπεὶ περίσσοι γυναικῶν.

'We, poor islanders, who have the advantage of knowing you by sight, have sent the contingent of suitors which you see. If the Achaeans in Iason Argos caught sight of you, what a crowd there would be tomorrow!' The ancients

connected
Forsch. i. p
of quantity
that Krets
the Ionian

I ope
Homeric p
to οἱ μὲν
is singular
Still even
'Ιλιάδος ὡ
τοιαῖτης τ
ἀπήγριπσε
εἴθ ἔξης π
τὸ τρίτον
of exhaust
conceive
applied to
in Nicola
Orchomen
with the
Locrians

Orchomen
of μέν su
insist on
women,
I must c
to be a
have ex
several p
Pers
Athenian
lover of
have 'Ic
Laconia,
ante-Gre
as we s
τοῖς ἐξ
fr. 37 (

"Ιασος κ
τὴν βασ
"Ιασος δ

¹ On th

the argos as
according to
B681 is in
δῆφεων, οὓς
λεξάνδρειαν,
καὶ τὰ ὄστα
οἱ προφήτης
history is
56 (Migne,
Moschus,
translation of
s. (I owe
The work
animalibus
sends me
(ἐν "Αργείος
death to
Assyria seem
clerical
may have
only in the
Argos was a
the sense
white'
s always
Iliad and
Argos
λαστικούν.
Penelope a
ht, have
n Argos
ancients

connected *Ιασον* with *Ιάονες*, and so for the most part the moderns (E. Meyer *Forsch.* i. p. 94 and elsewhere, Busolt ed. 2 i. 283 n. 3), but the double difference of quantity, *Ιασον* *Ιάονες* and the presence of sigma are against it. I notice that Kretschmer *Glotta* i. 13, 14 does not reckon *Ιασον* among the cognates of the Ionian name.

I open a parenthesis to remark that it cannot be denied that in the one Homeric passage where this name occurs, N 685 sqq., *Ιάονες* in 585 corresponds to *οἱ μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι προλεγμένοι* 689, although the double name for one people is singular at such a short distance, and the construction of *μὲν* 689 is strange. Still even by Galen's quaint system of counting xviii. 2. 676 ἐν δὲ τῷ νῦ τῆς Ἰλιάδος ὥσπερ ἐξεπίτηδες ἐνοεῖσασθαι Βουλόμενος ὡς οὐ χρὴ πεφροντικέναι τῆς τουατῆς τάξεως, πάντα καταλέξεις ἐφεξῆς πράγματα πρὸς μὲν τὸ δεύτερον (Iaones) ἀγρύντησε πρῶτον (Athenians), εἴθ' ἐξῆς πρὸς τὸ πρώτον (Boeotians, sc. Phidas etc.), εἴθ' ἐξῆς πρὸς τὸ πέμπτον (Epeans), εἴτα πρὸς τὸ τέταρτον (Phthians), εἴτα πρὸς τὸ τρίτον (Locrians, sc. Ajax)—every nation is accounted for, and by a process of exhaustion Iaones and Athenians are the same. It is difficult however to conceive the circumstances under which in the heroic age the Ionian name applied to Athens only; overt evidence that it did not is given by the story in Nicolaus of Damascus (c. 53) of the war between the Ionians and the Orchomenians. Athenians could have made no direct war on Orchomenus, with the Homeric Boeotians between. The term must have applied to the Locrians of Opus and Larymna, and the war have been between them and Orchomenus. In Hecataeus *fr. 343* Ion is a Locrian.¹ Therefore, as the position of *μὲν* suggests, there must have been an omission in the passage. I do not insist on Nicolaus' further detail that the children of the captive Orchomenian women, expelled by their Ionian fathers, εἰς Θορικὸν τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἀπεχώρησαν. I must delay a moment to notice that any passage is more likely than this to be an 'Athenian interpolation' (Leaf). An Athenian interpolation would have exhibited Athens as the mother of historical Ionia, not as one among several petty tribes in a small area. I return to the *"Ιασον" Αργείος*.

Person-names similar to *Ιασον* are common; in Homer there is *"Ιασον* an Athenian O 332, 337, *Τάσιόν* an Orchomenian λ 283, a Cyprian ρ 443, *Ιασίων* lover of Demeter ε 125. I need not go further afield. As a place-name we have *"Ιασον* or *"Ιαστος* in Caria, *"Ιασον* a πόλισμα on the north border of Laconia, Paus. vii. 13. 7. The word therefore seems a real one and probably ante-Greek. As to its topographical meaning in this passage, the usual belief, as we see in Strabo 369 cited above, was that it meant Peloponnesus (*οὐ γὰρ τοὺς ἐξ ὅλης τῆς Ἑλλάδος εἰκός, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἐγγύις*). One logographer, Hellanicus *fr. 37* (=schol. Γ 75), gave a more precise definition, however he arrived at it; *"Ιασον* καὶ Πελασγὸς Τριόπα παιδεῖς τελευτήσαντος δὲ αὐτοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς διείλοντο τὴν Βασιλείαν. λαχὼν δὲ Πελασγὸς μὲν τὰ πρὸς Ἐρασίνον ποταμὸν ἔκτισε Λάρισαν, *"Ιασον* δὲ τὰ πρὸς Ἡλιν (Ιλιον MS.). The realm of Iasus was the Elis side of

¹ On these peoples there is abundant information in *Δοκίμια* by W. A. Oldfather, *Philologus*, 1908.

Peloponnesus; and this is demanded by the passage in the *Odyssey*. When Professor E. Meyer says (*Forsch.* l.c.) the Ithacans had nothing to do with the Peloponnesians, he hardly realises the conditions. To the inhabitants of the archipelago which with Corfu added we call the Ionian islands, 'land,' *ηπειρος*, meant the west coast of Peloponnesus. The continent opposite them was in the hands of Taphians and Teleboans (the latter a land-people, if Amphitryon *Hes. Scut.* 19 conducted a land-war against them); their social and commercial dealings were with the long flat coast which south of Araxus is only broken by Chelonatas and Ichthys; here they possessed land (B 635 *αι τ' ηπειρον ἔχον* *ηδ' ἀντιπέραι' ἐνέμοντο*).¹ Noemon δ 635 wishes to cross 'Ηλιος' *ἐς ειρύχορον*, where he keeps his twelve mares and his unbroken mules; the writer of the *Telegonia*, an even more local poem than the *Odyssey*, tells how after the burial of the suitors Ulysses *εἰς Ἡλιον ἀποτλει ἐπισκεψόμενος τὰ βουκόλια*; the legend of Pheneus (Paus. viii. 14) made him keep his horses as far off as that.² The linguistic evidence is held to shew that the islanders were a colony from Triphylia (Hoffmann ap. Collitz *Dial. Inschr.* ii. 166); according to Aristarchus reported by Epaphroditus ap. Steph. Byz. in *Δοιλίχιον* the Dolichians were called *'Επειοι*, and cf. Strabo 456; in their isolation the *νησιώται* regarded their mother-land as the world. These circumstances fall in with Hellanicus' partition. The Iason argos was the plain of Hollow Elis and Triphylia. On this coast also we find the curious names *Σαμικόν*, *Φειά*, *Χάα*, *Ιάρδανος*, which point anywhere but to the Greek tongue. *Τασσον* with its Carian cousin may go with them.³

'Αργος πελασγικόν in Homer is the valley of the Spercheus and the Maliac Gulf as far as Echinus and Alope on the north and (probably) Pylae on the south (C.R. 1906, 193 sq.). Mr. Myres remarks (J.H.S. 1907, 179 n. 16) that analogy suggests that a specific town is intended. Not necessarily; the section on Sparta B 581-590 is introduced by the district, *κοιλην Δακεδαιμόνα κητώσσαν*, after which follow the towns Pharis, Sparta, Messe, Bryseae, Augeae, Amyclae, Helos, Laas and Oetylus. I find it difficult also to believe that *Πελασγικόν* is a descriptive epithet 'suggested by . . . remains of early or at all events pre-Achaean fortifications.' In the cases where the adj. in *-κός* is given to places it is locative: *'Αμφιλοχικόν*, *'Αχαικόν Όρεστικόν*. Further, Δάρισσα *Πελασγία* only a little beyond Echinus is suggestive. The domain of Peleus also included the vague aboriginal districts Phthia and Hellas, and of the three names of their inhabitants one was *'Αχαιοί*. Hellas moved in later days, Achaeans and Phthia crystallised into the district known as Achaia Phthiotis. The valley of the Spercheus lost its importance in the Dorian system, and became a halt between

¹ Here I am happy to find myself in agreement with Mr. Leaf, against Strabo 461.

² This among other reasons tells against believing the heroic Ithaca to have been the historical Leucas, whatever may have been the name of the Mycenaean community in the latter. If Ithaca had been Leucas, a large peninsula with valleys and abundant soil, it

would either have had no peraea, or if it had, that peraea must have been the mainland from which it was only separated by its lagoon.

³ Fick, *Vorgriechische Ortsnamen*, 1905, p. 121, while suggesting the connection with *Ιασσον* thinks of Argolis, which whatever *Ιασσον* may mean is inconceivable.

two passes; and its name have said be river-valley, and of the 1

Before the Homeric of Mycenae Pellen, Ae Gonoessa, a Orneae, Go lower cours the only or Argolis. T and Asine under Dion Mecisteus. less Mycenae was therefore entirely or dodecapolis told of any that the (peraea) and no foothold overland o

These whole of t comme de

Agamem

¹ On the t Mitt. xxxi of a Κρόκοι

two passes; its glory went to the nobles of Pharsalus (nonexistent in Homer), and its name was attracted to the *τετραρχία* Pelasgiotis. I will repeat what I have said before, that for Homer Achilles is a local chieftain, owning a long river-valley, limited at its mouth by the kingdoms of Protesilaus to the north and of the lesser Ajax to the south, and an undefined hinterland.¹

III.

Before we discuss "Αργος Ἀχαικόν" and "Αργος" alone, it is desirable to notice the Homeric account of Agamemnon's own kingdom. It consists B 569 sqq. of Mycenae, Corinth, Cleoneae, Orneae, Araethyrea, Sicyon, Hyperesia, Gonoessa, Pellene, Aegium, 'all the Aegialus,' Helice. Of these places Cleoneae, Orneae, Gonoessa, and Araethyrea are mountain-villages, Cleoneae on the road to Corinth, Orneae, Gonoessa, and Araethyrea at the head of the Asopus valley, on the lower course of which Phlius (not in Homer) and Sicyon stand, but Mycenae is the only one on the southern side, and the only one in the valley later called Argolis. This valley containing the towns of Argos, Tiryns, and also Hermione and Asine in a deep gulf,² Troezen, Eioneae, Epidaurus, Aegina and Mases, were under Diomedes the stranger, Sthenelus son of Capaneus, and Euryalus son of Mecisteus. The Argolid kingdom proper consisted of the valley of the Inachus, less Mycenae, and the whole of the Hermionic and Epidaurian peninsula. It was therefore largely maritime. Agamemnon's seaboard on the other hand lay entirely on the gulf of Corinth, as far as the Epean border, and included the dodecapolis, mother of historical Ionia, itself in history Achaea. We are not told of anything corresponding to the later Cenchreæ, and it is to be presumed that the *Catalogue* views the Saronic Gulf generally up to Salamis (and its peraea) and Athens as the property of the Argolid monarchy. Agamemnon had no foothold on the Argolic Gulf, and therefore his access to Mycenae was overland only.

These conditions are not merely stated in the *Catalogue*, they hold for the whole of the two poems. When Diomedes returns from Troy he lands 'in Argos,' *comme de juste*.

γ 180 τέτρατον δημαρ ἔην ὅτ' ἐν "Αργεῖ νῆσας εἴσας
Τυδείδεω ἔπαροι Διομήδεος ἵπποδάμοιο
ἔστασαν.

Agamemnon's *νόστος* was quite different:

δ 512 σὸς δέ που ἔκφυγε κῆρας ἀδελφεὸς ήδ' ὑπάλυξεν
ἐν νησὶ γλαφυρῆσι σώσθε δὲ πότινα "Ηρη.
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ τάχ' ἔμελλε Μαλειάων ὅρος αἰπεῖ
ἴξεσθαι, τότε δὴ μιν ἀναρπάξασα θύελλα

¹ On the topography of Phthiotis see Staehlin *Athēn. Mitt.* xxxi. 1 sq. (1906). It is curious that we hear of a Κρόκιον *τεῖδιον*, not a Κρόκιον *δρυός*.

² The Homeric phrase *βαθὺν κατὰ κόλπων ἔχοντας* seems translated by the Hesiodic *παρέξ δῆλα παιεναύσας*.

πόντον ἐπ' ἵχθυόντα φέρεν βάρεα στενάχοντα,
ἀγροῦ ἐπ' ἐσχατιήν, ὅθι δώματα ναῖα Θνέστης
τὸ πρίν, ἀτάρ τότε ἔναι Θνεστιάδης Αἴγισθος.
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ κείθεν ἐφάνετο νόστος ἀπίμων,
ἄψ δὲ θεοὶ οὐρον στρέψαν καὶ οἴκαδ' ἰκοντο,
ἥτοι οὐ μὲν χαίρων ἐπεβήστε πατρίδος αἷς.

'Now thy brother escaped and avoided death on shipboard, for Hera saved him. But when he was soon about to come to the steep hill of Maleae, at that time a storm caught him and bare him out to sea, sore groaning, to the end of the land, where once Thystes had his house and at that time Aegisthus, son of Thystes, had his. But when there appeared a safe passage from that place also, and the Gods turned the wind, and they reached their home, he set foot on his fatherland.' The voyage was good as far as Malea; at Malea the storm caught him (as it caught Menelaus and Odysseus; it spared Nestor). Why did Agamemnon make for Malea? for the same reason that Nestor, Odysseus and Menelaus did,—that it lay between him and his home. This surely is absolutely plain. Modern commentators however, at least from Nitzsche to Mr. Agar, under the obsession of Tragic anachronisms, say to themselves 'welchen Weg hatte er also genommen, dass er eher auf Maleia zukam als an die heimische Küste von Argos und Mykenä?' What a route indeed! The rest of the voyage though elliptic is easy. It is elliptical because that is the ancient manner,¹ and we have had one storm off Malea already (*y* 286) and are to have another (180). The wind 'blew him out to sea, to the end of the land'; Andron (*F.H.G.* ii. 350) said to Cythera, but this explanation is taken from the parallel experience of Odysseus, *i* 81, where my family *a* actually read παρέπλαγξεν δὲ Κυθήροις; and also an island can hardly be called ἐρχατή γαῖη. 'The verge of the land' must have been some part of the coast which they managed to make, the hereditary portion of the younger branch of the house of Pelops. This may have been the later Messenia, as we see I 292-294 that Agamemnon is able to dispose of a number of towns on this coast. Hera Agamemnon *quassas refecit rates* (Aegisthus of course was away from home, at Corinth or Mycenae, playing his own game),² and when the wind changed and heaven sent a good passage, he reached his home at the head of the Corinthian gulf without more adventure.

This is a consistent picture. I will add that it looks as though Menelaus also made his much-deferred homecoming to Corinth.³ For 'the very day that Orestes buried his mother and Aegisthus, came valiant Menelaus,' πολλὰ κτήματ' ἄγων ὅτα οἱ νέες ἄχθος ἀειραν. And Telemachus' question implies he would naturally have been there, ποῦ Μενέλαος ἔην;—ἢ οὐκ Ἀργεος ἦν Ἀχαιοῦ; A great part of the Peloponnese, all except Argos, Triphylia, Arcadia and Elis

¹ Galen vi. 106 τὸ δὲ τῆς παλαιᾶς ἐρυγρελας εἶδος οὐτοις ἀντὶ βραχιόγονος ὡς πολλὰ πολλάκις ὑπερβαίνειν δοκεῖν τὴν Μέσην τῶν δὲ ἀνάγκης ἐπορέων τοὺς λεγομένους, sim. ix. 760, x. 275. What Galen felt of Ionic prose is true and even more true of Epos.

² And therefore need not, at Bothe's hands, endure transposition.

³ Dictys vi. 2 puts Idomeneus and other heroes at Corinth when the war was over.

was more
were given

2. A
kingdom
forces un
which to
many and
imaginati
Thessalia
as they a
the Lapi
regulation
temple-a
first that
for Asia
indeed, a
spot, as
the ship
ports of
inlets or
lands ha
locked
were th
the roa
landed,
roads o
sailing
to Auli
put in
sent fr

At
at Tro
figure
Catalog
Aulis,
book a
pology
called
like t
his le
selves
they
enoug

was more or less directly dependent on Agamemnon. The princes of the house were given *terres*, independent as Menelaus, dependent (apparently) as Aegisthus.

2. Another circumstance of the Trojan War which fits in with Agamemnon's kingdom is the rendezvous of the international fleet at Aulis. Why did the forces under the hegemony of the King of Men collect at a port in a country which took no prominent part in the Trojan War? This question has drawn many and elaborate answers, of which the one most in accord with the higher imagination is that the locality is a survival from the original North Grecian or Thessalian Iliad, those spectres of the learned. In ancient matters, in proportion as they are ancient, reasons and causes are simple. What does the Stele under the Lapis Niger contain? Only, as far as the Latin can be made out, a police-regulation. Mr. Hogarth's silver plate from the slime of the Cayster bears a temple-account. The reason why the Greek armada rendezvoused at Aulis was first that Agamemnon had no port on the west coast of Greece. A fleet destined for Asia could not be asked to meet in the Corinthian Gulf. The princes indeed, at the preliminary *ἀγέρμος*, met Agamemnon at Aegium, a very central spot, as central as Delphi, according to the local story (Paus. vii. 24. 2), but the ships naturally required an anchorage on the west. Agamemnon had no ports of his own, the later Nauplia if it existed belonged to Argolis; the Athenian inlets or Salamis might have afforded an anchorage, but would these little barren lands have provided the *ravitaillement* of such an armada? The all but land-locked bays of the Euripus were obvious. Aulis and the neighbouring inlets were the port of Boeotia; hence the Aeolic migration started (Strabo 401). Here the road to Thebes and the pilgrims' way to Delphi began. If Cadmus ever landed, he landed here. In later times, when political circumstances made the roads of Aulis no longer free, Geraestus in Euboea was a rendezvous for a fleet sailing to Asia. Agesilaus, reminded of Agamemnon, transferred his anchorage to Aulis, and offended the Thebans by doing so. At Aulis Demetrius Poliorcetes put in (Diod. xx. 100). A potentate who had to collect a fleet of 1186 sail, sent from all parts of Greece, would naturally choose the Euripus.

Another question has been asked: Why do the Boeotians, who cut no figure at Troy, take the first place in the *Catalogue*? Not because they cut a better figure in some earlier epos, or in some earlier stage of this epos, but because the *Catalogue*, as is plain, represents the original arrangement of the contingents at Aulis, and was taken by Homer from its place and time in saga to his second book and to the Troad. (And hence, in case anyone with Mr. Murray, *Anthropology and the Classics*, p. 67, doubts if 'the *Cypria* as a poem can definitely be called later than the *Iliad*', there is no Greek Catalogue in the *Cypria*, which like the rest of the Cycle was conditioned body and soul by Homer, and took his leavings.) The Boeotians as masters of the soil and the waters, gave themselves the first place in the fleet. We may conjecture that with their fifty sail they filled the *ὅρμος* of Aulis, which according to Strabo 403 is only large enough *πεντήκοντα πλοῖοις*, and that the rest occupied the inlets on both coasts.

And thirdly, why is the whole *Catalogue* referred to as *Bouxtia*? The answer to this is easy; according to the Greek custom, familiar in scholastic matters (of which this is one), of quoting a series of things by the first of them: e.g. schol. A Γ 277 [ἡ διτλῆ] πρὸς τὴν ἀθέτησιν τὸν ἐν Ὁδυσσείᾳ ὡκέα δὲ ἡλιών ὑπερίοντος ἄγγελος ἥλθεν. The athetesis covered sixteen lines. Apoll. Dysc. *pronom.* 109. 20 Schneider τὸ μέντος ἀλλ' αἰεὶ φρεσὶν ἡσυχὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐμαῖς εὐλόγως ὑπ' Ἀριστάρχου ὑπωπτεύετο ὡς νόθον. Four lines (v. 320-323) were athetised.

The later Ὁμηροί never completely realised prae-Dorian history in this respect. They wavered between the prevailing political conception of a single Dorian Argos, and the statements in Homer. Strabo 372 recognises Agamemnon's northern possessions but adds καὶ δὴ καὶ τὴν Ἀργολικὴν τῆς Μυκηναίας προσέθηκεν, the exact contrary of the truth. Pausanias ii. 4. 2, his mind full of different Corinthian traditions, is aware that the Corinthians were not an independent nation at the siege of Troy, but conceives of them as subject to the 'dynasts at Mycenae or Argos.' Ephorus (fr. 28=Strabo 462) must be given the credit of facing the facts and inventing a story to account for Agamemnon as well as Diomede being king of Argos. It is that while Diomede with most of his men was away on a campaign in Acarnania, Agamemnon seized Argolis; but when the Trojan war broke out, he recalled Diomede ἐπὶ τε τὴν Ἀργούς ἀπόληψιν καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν τοῦ πολέμου. This is a real 'combination,' a type of the genus, and a good contrast to the unadapted statements of *epos*.

These are the political conditions, in the *Iliad*, of the district afterwards known as Argos and Argolis. We must next examine the usage of the word in Homer. First it denotes as in later times the valley of the Inachus, both the town (B 559) and the district (γ 180). This is its sense in the story of Theoclymenus ο 224, 239, 240 (Argolis whence Amphiarus started for Thebes), and in Diomede's mouth Z 224 Ε 119 (πατὴρ δὲ ἐμὸς Ἀργεῖος νάσθη). The Argos which Hera loved Δ 52 is presumably that in sight of her temple; and this is the meaning of her title Ἀργεῖη Δ 8 Ε 908 (local, in antithesis to Ἀλαλκομενῆς Ἀθῆνη). An epithet is devoted to Argolis T 114:

"Ηρη δὲ αἴξαστος λίπεν ρίον Οὐλύμπιοιο,
καρπαλίμιως δὲ ἵκετ' Ἀργος Ἀχαικὸν ἐνθ' ἄρα πῦδη
ἰφθιμην ἀλοχον Σθενέλον Περσημάδαο.

The claims of the Perseidae to be Achaean are not obvious, but their story connects them with Mycenae, and to make light of the passage would be to fall into the petitio principii which belongs as of right to advanced interpretation. To Argolis on the same ground belongs Ἀργος ἐσ ἵππόβοτον Ο 30 in a Heracles-episode, and probably Argos the town φ 108. The phrase Achaean Argos however occurs also in Agamemnon's mouth I 141

εἰ δέ κεν Ἀργος ἰκούμεθ' Ἀχαικόν, οὐθαρ ἀρούρης,
γαμβρός κέν μοι ἔοι,

where he is thinking of his own kingdom, his three daughters and the seven Messenian villages he will give as dowry. It would be hard to make Ἀργος

Ἀχαικό^ν
large.

Ἀργεος
interpre
and He
that the
Men ha

Ἀργος
and so
is not
kingdon

Sisyphus
combin
as 'at
argos, o
τ' ἀν
was cal
coast v
passage
the Ae
remains
ιστορεῖ
λαβύρι
τῶν Ἐλ
ικήσαν

Wi
express
or whe
ἴπποβο
is to t
plain o
ει τὸ μ
968).

¹ For δι
read with
reading 'ε
ω 37. To
read δι

² It sur
the Cori
a μοίρα τ
here calls
δι Σικυώ

The answer
tic matters
: e.g. schol.
λίῳ ὑπερίον
ομ. 109. 20
ν' Ἀρισ-

ory in this
of a single
agamemnon's
προσέθηκεν,
of different
dependent
the 'dynasts
the credit
as well as
of his men
but when
δληψιν καὶ
the genus,

afterwards
the word
chus, both
the story of
(or Thebes),
The Argos
and this
αλκομενῆς

their story
ould be to
interpretation
O 30 in
Achaean

the seven
e "Argos

'Αχαικὸν ὁδθαρ ἀρούρης refer to a castle on a hill; it is his fertile land at large. The question put by Telemachus γ 249 ποῦ Μενέλαος ἔηρ; . . . η οὐκ 'Αργεος ἦεν 'Αχαικοῦ ἀλλά πη ἀλλη πλάζετ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους; can only be interpreted of Mycenae if we insist that Agamemnon's murder took place there; and Homer neither states nor implies this. *Prima facie* it is more probable that the ambush and the slaughter took place at Corinth before the King of Men had time to look round.¹ We see therefore that in one case 'Αχαικὸν 'Αργος means Argolis, in a second Agamemnon's kingdom which is not Argolis, and some place in Agamemnon's kingdom in a third. The epithet therefore is not distinctive as between Corinth and Argolis. Now that Agamemnon's kingdom could be called 'Αργος appears from Z 152

ἔστι πόλις Ἐφύρη μυχῷ 'Αργεος ἵπποβότοιο,
ἔνθα δὲ Σίσυφος ἔσκεν.

Sisyphus is firmly connected with Corinth and with no other place. Mr. Leaf's combinations (ad l.) cannot be allowed. We must admit that Corinth is described as 'at the end of the plain.' The Agamemnonian kingdom was in fact an argos, or a succession of arge, a riviera, a plain or plains by the sea; αἰγαλόν τ' ἀνὰ πάτα is part of its entry in the *Catalogue*; one of the Sicyonian tribes was called Αἰγιαλεῖς (Herod. v. 51). The word as a specific designation of this coast was superseded in historical times by 'Αχαΐα, but it survives in one passage.² In the version of the oracle quoted above given by Ion and Mnaseas the Aegeians not the Megarians were the applicants; a portion of this version remains in two articles in Suidas, Αἴγιεις and Υμεῖς. In the latter it is said ιστορεῖ δὲ Μνασέας ὅτι Αἴγιεις οἱ ἐν 'Αχαιᾳ καταναυμαχήσαντες Αἴτωλοις καὶ λαβόντες πεντηκόντορον αὐτῶν δεκάτην Πυθοὶ ἀνατίθεντες ἥρατων τίνες εἶεν κρείττους τῶν Ἐλλήνων. In the shorter version s. Αἴγιεις we read οἱ γαρ ἐν 'Αργει Αἴγιεις νικήσαντες κτλ. Of the two 'Αχαιά is the gloss.

With so much ascertained we can give a definite meaning to Agamemnon's expressions. When he calls his kingdom ἄργος 'Αχαικὸν ὁδθαρ ἀρούρης I 141, 283, or when it is said of Aegisthus γ 263 he wooed Agamemnon's wife μυχῷ 'Αργεος ἵπποβότοιο (whether the courting took place at Corinth or Mycenae), the reference is to the fertility of the north coast of Peloponnesus, especially the broader plain of Corinth and Sicyon. The fame of this fertility survives in the proverb εἰ τὸ μέσον κτήσαιο Κορινθον καὶ Σικυώνος (εὐφορος γύρῳ η χώρα schol. Ar. *Birds* 968). 'Ιππόβοτος³ is justified by the story of Pegasus and Bellerophon, the

¹ For ἔδεις 'Αργεος γ 260 the sense shows we must read with the minority of the MSS. ἔδεις δέρετος. The reading 'Αργεος was brought by ἔδεις from I 146 8 99 ω 37. To avoid the neglect of the digamma we may read ἔδει with Bekker or δέρει with Mr. Agar.

² It survives also in Pausanias, who distinctly says that Corinth (ii. 1. 1) and Sicyon (ib. 7. 1) are each a μοίρα τῆς 'Αργειας; viii. 1. 2 he defines what he here calls 'Αργειος by saying it includes Sicyon, μερὰ δε Σικυώνα 'Αχαιοι τὸ δέρεύθεν εἰσιν. The coincidence

between these passages and the usage of the term in Homer cannot be denied; but it is not plain if Pausanias uses the word geographically or politically; in the second passage (ii. 7. 1) he appears to conceive the name as a mark and result of the conquests of Dorian Argos.

³ Like other epic attributes it is not superlative or exclusive. The predication is made without reference. Land near Chalcis was called ἡ Ιππόβοτος, the Horse-meadow, Ael. *V.H.* vi. 1.

invention of the bridle (Pindar *Ol.* 13), the trademarks *koppa* (Corinth) and *sampi* (Sicyon). The attribute *πολωνίφιον* Δ 171 is no hindrance; any Mediterranean land watered by short torrents falling at a considerable slope and turning into *ghiarre* in the summer may be called thirsty. The Achaean riviera had a better title to the epithet than Argolis, with its swamp and its water-snake.¹ The Italian Marche are an example of a land which is at once thirsty and fertile. When Agamemnon A 30 says *ἡμετέρῳ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ ἐν "Αργει* (and sim. B 115 I 22) he refers to his *παραλία*, and so Idomeneus N 378 *δοίμεν δ' Ἀτρείδαο θυγατρῶν εἶδος ἀρίστην "Αργεος ἔξαγαγότες ὄπινέμει.*

We may notice some other possibly local usages.

Menelaus δ 174 sq. tells Telemachus how he would like to have brought his father bodily to his own country and settled him near him:

καὶ κέ οι "Αργεί νάσσα πόλιν καὶ δώματ' ἔτενεῖ
ἔξ Ιθάκης ἀγαγὸν σὸν κτήμασι καὶ τεκεῖ φ
καὶ πάσιν λαοῖσι, μίαν πόλιν ἔξελαπάξας
αἱ περιναετάσσουν ἀνάσσουν δ' ἐμοὶ αὐτῷ.
καὶ κε θάμ' ἐνθάδ' ἔοντες ἐμισγόμεθ.

This is all very local, there is no question of Argolis or 'Achaea.' Is *ἄργει* used *όνοματικῶς*, as 'the plain,' or the delta of the Eurotas?

Hector, foreseeing his wife's fate, Z 456, says:

καὶ κεν ἐν "Αργει ἐσῆσα πρὸς ἄλλης ιστὸν ὑφαίνοις,
καὶ κεν ὑδροφόρεοις Μεσσηίδος η 'Υπερείης
πόλλα' αεκάδουμένη.

Did Hector mean the whole passage generically?—the middle and the upper well? or, as seems more epical, did the saga-poet take these names from some town of his acquaintance and put them into Hector's mouth? and what town? The same or similar names are common. 'Υπερησία was the old name of Aegira in 'Achaea' (Strabo 383, Paus. vii. 26. 2); Μεσσηίς was a fountain at Therapne (*ib.* iii. 20. 1) and 'Υπέρεια at Troezen (*ib.* ii. 30. 8); both were pointed out by the Pharsalians (Strabo 432), and a well Hypereia existed *ἐν μέσῃ τῆς Φεραίων πόλει* (*ib.* 439 Pindar Pyth. iv. 125), and another is mentioned in Eurypylius' section in the *Catalogue* B 734. These two localities therefore throw no light on the *"Αργεος* in question, if it be specific; but Hector would probably imagine his wife becoming Agamemnon's slave. Lastly, what does the famous predication of Agamemnon mean

πολλῆσσιν νῆσοισι καὶ "Αργει παντὶ ἀνάσσους?

We have seen what his actual kingdom was; but 'my whole coast' is no great title; nor is it likely, if possible, to take *παντὶ* distributively, 'every valley' (and the Iason argos was not his): the other member shews that *"Αργεος* means more. There are no islands attached to 'Achaea,' the Argolic islands belonged

¹ Aristotle *Meteor.* 352 a 8 said Argolis was *διάθητη* and uncultivated in heroic days.

to Stheno
hardly cou
of Agame
islands d
land, from

Beside
which "A
this sense
ω 37 (H
speakers
of the fo
Δαυοί;
possibly "

What
word? I

The
meant th
Pelasgic
Argos by
propositio
assume a
called co
as the m
induction
cover mo
the whol
which A
Greek co
if its int
the island

Sign
they real
Valais;
Switzerla
political.
natural;
still the
'Fiedmo
moved to
The spre
people to

Corinth) and
; any Medi-
le slope and
chaeon riviera
nd its water-
at once thirsty

yei (and sim.
v δ' Ἀτρεῖδαο

have brought

Achaea.' Is

le and the
names from
? and what
the old name
s fountain at
were pointed
, ἐν μέσῃ τῇ
mentioned in
es therefore
ector would
, what does

is no great
valley' (and
pyor means
ds belonged
ya.

to Sthenelus; Cerigo and Cerigotto, possessions no doubt of Menelaus, can hardly count as 'many.' It is plain we must interpret the line of the hegemony of Agamemnon, the peoples who answered to his call. The 'islands' are the islands duly registered in the *Catalogue*, Cos, Carpathus, etc., "Αργος is the land, from Oloosson to Lacedaemon.

Beside these specific uses of the term, there are also the general uses, in which "Αργος means Greece and 'Αργεῖοι Greeks. The substantive occurs in this sense at B 287, 348, H 363, I 246, M 70, N 227, O 372, T 229, Ω 437, δ 99, ω 37 (H 363 said by Paris conceivably meant Lacedaemon). Among the speakers are Achilles and Nestor; the term therefore was natural in the mouth of the former. The adjective everyone knows is an equivalent of 'Αχαιοι and Δασαιοι; the only exceptions are "Ηρη 'Αργεῖην, 'Αργεῖων Δασαῶν θ 578 and possibly 'Αργεῖη Ελένη.

IV.

What is the relation between the specific and the general sense of the word? Did the latter grow out of the former, and by what process?

The ancients answered this question by saying that Argos in Homer meant the Peloponnesus, Argos Achaicum meant the same thing, and Argos Pelasgicum meant Thessaly. The latter two phrases we have examined. That Argos by itself was the name of Peloponnesus is, so stated, an untenable proposition. We know of no word ἄργος except ἄργος=πεδίον and cannot assume another without this original meaning; and that Peloponnesus was ever called connotatively 'Plain' is impossible: no land so little deserved the name as the mountainous, indented, wooded island of Pelops. The statement is an induction from the usage of Homer, and a bad induction; the terms in Homer cover more than Peloponnesus. 'Αργεῖοι, like Δασαιοι or κοιροι 'Αχαιῶν, includes the whole host, islanders and North-Greeks. "Αργος T 329 is the country which Achilles is not to see again. Argos and Argivi connote the whole Greek country and the whole of its inhabitants. How did it come to do this if its intrinsic meaning is not true of the Peloponnesus, and even less true of the islands?

Significant names appear to be bestowed on places in two ways: (a) when they really apply; for instance "Ηλις, Holland, Iceland, Piemonte, Canton du Valais; (b) when they do not apply, or no longer apply; e.g. England, Switzerland, Romagna. The former process may be called natural, the latter political. The application of the term Argos to Greece at large is clearly not natural; I suggest that it was a political term. In Italian clerical circles it is still the fashion to call the actual kingdom, government and army of Italy 'Piedmontese'; circumstances can be conceived—suppose the Holy See had moved to Malta or to Corsica—when Italy might have been known as Piemonte. The spread of a name really belonging to a place or people to a place and people to which it does not belong, is a commonplace even in the ancient

world; in Greece the expansion and contraction of the terms Achaea and Hellas are typical. Now the term Argos in Homer occurs, besides the passages we have already quoted, in two antitheses to exactly these words:

ἀν' Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἀργος *a* 344 δ 726, 816 ο 80
 Ἀργος ἐς ἵππόθοτον καὶ Ἀχαιός καλλιγύνακα *Γ* 75, 258.

Hellas in Homer is a district to the north of the upper waters of the Spercheus; when Greek literature begins again, it connotes the whole Greek race. Achaea and Achaean in Homer mean the race, in later history the word is limited to the coast between Pagasae and cape Posidium, and to the north coast of Peloponnesus. The steps of the process cannot be given, but the beginning and the end of that process, contrary in either case, are plain. The antitheses between these two terms and Argos show that Argos is a third example of the genus. It combines with Hellas and again with Achaeis to express in a figurative way, the whole of Greece. It is therefore the kind of place-name which we may expect to find both local and general. Now mediaeval history fortunately explains itself; we know why and how a Danish tribe settled on our east coast gave its name to our island. The various Englefields discernible in Berkshire do not darken our historical eye, and we find canton Schwyz compatible with the country Schweiz. We accept also the fact, obscure though it is, that the Romans chose the unknown *Γραικοί* by whom to designate the Hellenic race. What local Argives, and by what process, asserted their right to give the Greeks an immortal name?

Does the change date from the Achaean or Homeric world? Was Agamemnon with his Mycenæo-Corinthian kingdom, his argos, so important that the Greeks as his subjects were called *'Aργεῖοι*? Hardly; we must not exaggerate the overlordship of the ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν, whose position, with its undeniable prerogatives, has been defined by Mr. Lang (*Homer and his Age* c. 4 and 5, *Anthropology and the Classics* p. 51 sq.). Or did the Inachian Argos supply the Greeks with a single name? Not during the Achaean period, when it was of no particular importance and did not belong to the Overlord.

There are however indications that 'Argos' held a different position before the day of the Atridae. The castles of Mycenæ and Tiryns can hardly have been originally in different hands, and the Argolis-valley is connected with the northern watershed by a system of narrow paved and bridged roads. Paving, as Prof. E. Meyer (*Gesch. d. Alt.* ii. 170, 180) observes, implies the passage of chariots, that is to say a military not a commercial thoroughfare. Mere goods can be conveyed along unpaved bridlepaths on beasts or on men's backs—as took place between the Valtellina and the Engadine, and the Engadine and Davos till not long ago. Now a strategic or military road over a pass implies that both ends of it belong to the same power. The tunnel under the col de Fréjus, which we call the Mont Cenis, was made by the kingdom of Sardinia at a time when Savoy and Piedmont were in the same hands, and to unite two parts of the same country. The North German canal connects German waters. In

Agamemnon
 doubt val
 of itself t
 these trad
 hands, and
 from one
 and receiv
 of its nam
 clearly th
 (B.S.A. 1
 Melos, ca
 Glotta i.
 name to
 inconsiste
 The Ach
 however
 race gave
 now to n
 Dukes of
 The new
 quest of
 wide sens
 an earlier
 race-name
 nothing c
 is largely
 American
 on the ot
 The full
 'Aργεῖο
 older wor
 Δαναοί m
 Danai of
 attacked.
 most sou
 dependen
 Greece, a
 the swart
 Acco
 MM. Pe
 A.M., th
 Boeotia t
 is the M
 NO. X.

Agamemnon's day Mycenae, his only possession on the southern side, was no doubt valuable, whether for pleasure or for safety; but it does not seem enough of itself to account for these elaborate communications. At the period when these tracks were paved Argolis and Corinth, the two arge, were in the same hands, and it was found worth while to provide for the speedy shifting of troops from one sea to the other. Such a kingdom, holding the *claustra Peloponnesi* and receiving the traffic of two worlds, might have given a political extension of its name to the whole country, North and South. The race who did so were clearly the people who built the castles of Argolis, who according to Dr. Mackenzie (*B.S.A.* 1906-7, p. 425) put an end to the empire of Cnossus and colonised Melos, call we them Mycenaeans, Pelasgians, or Ionians (with Kretschmer *Glotta* i. 9 sq.). Their Argos was not *Αχαικόν*; the incoming race added this name to the old word. *Αρύος*, like Phthia, remained a place-name, strictly inconsistent, like Provence or Lombardy, with actual political circumstances. The Achaeans divided the original kingdom, why we do not know (we know however why Savoy was given to Napoleon III.), the Hegemon of the new race gave up Argolis with the exception of Mycenae, and the paved roads led now to nothing but the 'summerpalace' with the tombs of the old kings. The Dukes of Savoy sleep in French soil, but then they were not buried at Modane. The new Corinthian dynasty recouped itself by expanding westwards; the conquest of Sicyon has its echo in the *Catalogue* (B 572). I submit then that the wide sense of Argos and Argive, meaning Greece and Greek, is a survival from an earlier *prae-Achaeān* civilisation. It is remarkable that while the other two race-names *Αχαιοί* and *Δαναοί* have their equivalents on foreign monuments, nothing corresponding to *Αργείοι* has been found. Nomenclature among nations is largely traditional and conventional; our diplomatic title is British, and the Americans and our colonists style us Britishers, but it is not a name we affect; on the other hand we are singular in calling the inhabitants of Holland Dutch. The full name of *prae-Achaeān* Greeks may have been longer than the simple *Αργείοι*; the Greeks may have abbreviated the term, while foreigners kept the older word. As *Αχαιοί* belongs to the new race, possibly the remaining term *Δαναοί* may have been the real old race-name, and the full style *Αργείοι Δαναοί*, Danai of Argos. The combination survives, θ 578, where it has been needlessly attacked. What in the other antithesis *Αχαιοί* means who shall say? The most southern point at which the name is fossilised in history is Agamemnon's dependency. In the phrase however it may mean northern as against southern Greece, and *καλλιγύναικα* may attest the effect of the blonde Achaeān belle upon the swarthy Mycenaeans.

According to Mr. Dawkin's *compte rendu*, *J.H.S.* 1908, pp. 323, 324, MM. Peet, Wace and Thompson, *C.R.* 1908, 236, and Mr. Wace in the current *A.M.*, the late stone age lasted longer in south Thessaly, Phthiotis and North Boeotia than elsewhere in Greece; that is to say the Bronze civilisation, which is the Mycenaeans, arrived there comparatively late. These are exactly the

ARGOS IN HOMER

districts to which the names Hellas and Achaea clung. In Homer there is no distinction, in manners, language or race, between one part of Greece and another, there is nothing to account for the antithesis between Argos and Hellas or Achaeis. If an excavation shews at one time during the Mycenaean period the boundary of North and South Greece was drawn a little south of the Cephissus beyond which for a long time the bronze culture of Argos or Mycenae did not penetrate, is not the antithesis accounted for? It is a survival in Homer from the flourishing days of the Mycenaean monarchy when the people of Achaea and Hellas were a kind of Picts and Scots.¹ The permanence of the name Achaea in this district also suggests that the Achaeans may have settled there for some time before they made their further advance southward.

After the Dorian conquest had moved away Pelasgian and Achaeans alike, the Dorian state of Argos appropriated the name and its associations. Corinth, except for one brief moment,² was never called Argos again. The Achaeans however clung to the shore of the Corinthian gulf. The conception that Agamemnon was king of Argos and Nauplia was consecrated by Tragedy, not more ignorant of the sentiment than of the facts of the heroic age. Its evidence is justly decried by Plutarch *Theseus* 16, 28, 29 and Pausanias i. 3. 3, 28. 7, 30. 4.

T. W. ALLEN.

¹ If Zerelia is not Itonos, is it Arne? Hesiod in the Aspis places it in this region (cf. C.R. 1906, 200). Such an ancient site (if it goes back to 3000 B.C.) would leave a name when it had ceased to be inhabited. Contrariwise the site Glá in Boeotia remains, but without a name (I suggested Γλήχων, C.R. 1902, 239). Further, do the epithets Argos

πελασγικῶν and Larissa πελασγία recall a moment when the Pelasgian frontier was more northerly, namely at Othrys? Frontier places, like Mezzo Lombardo, are often labelled.

² Xen. Hell. iv. 4. 6 ἀλεθανθένοι ἀφανίσθησαν τὴν πόλιν διὰ τὸ καὶ δρυς ἀναπάσθα καὶ Ἀργος ἀντὶ Κορίνθου τὴν παρίδα αὐτοῖς ὀνομάζεσθαι.

EM

STR

τέραν τὰ

τούς Θρή

Μάγνητα

sense, bu

Read εὖ

i. 3

τὴν θάλα

διέχοτος

i. 4

ὅτι σφα

δόξειν.

ii.

τὴν οὐκε

opposite

Read τ

iii.

φερόμενο

θαλάττιο

παρὰ is

that this

See Kra

iii.

γὰρ τὸ

regarded

fused as

iii.

τὴν παρ

γὰρ φάν

there is no
and another,
d Hellas or
n period the
he Cephisus
Iycenae did
al in Homer
le of Achaea
of the name
settled there

haean alike,
s. Corinth,
haean name
that Aga-
y, not more
evidence is
7, 30. 4.

J. ALLEN.

call a moment
more northerly,
es, like Mezo
φανιζομένην την
καὶ Ἀργος διτι
ii.

EMENDATIONS IN STRABO AND PLUTARCH'S MORALIA.

I. STRABO (*Kramer's text*).

STRABO i. 2. 20. ἡ τὴν Θράκην οὐκ οἶδε (sc. ὁ Ὄμηρος) μὴ προπίπτουσαν
πέραν τῶν Παιονικῶν καὶ Θετταλικῶν ὄρῶν; ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῦτη τὴν ἐφεξῆς κατὰ
τοὺς Θράκας εἰδὼς, καὶ τοὺς κατονομάζων τὴν τε παραλίαν καὶ τὴν μεσογαίαν
Μάγνητας μὲν τινας . . . καταλέγει κ.τ.λ. It is true that οὐκ is contrary to the
sense, but those who reject it should explain how it came into the passage.
Read εὐ κατονομάζων . . .

i. 3. 15. συγχωρήσας δὲ τῷ μετεωρισμῷ τοῦ ἐδάφους συμμετεωρισθείσαν καὶ
τὴν θάλατταν ἐπικλύσαι τοὺς μέχρι τοῦ μαρτιού τόπους, πλέον τῇ ἀπὸ θαλάττης
διέχοντος τῶν τρισχιλίων σταδίων. Read πλέον τι . . . (H = τι, as often).

i. 4. 1. καὶ περὶ τοῦ σχήματος δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἔξης διὰ πλειόνων ταῦτα δεικνύει,
ὅτι σφαιροειδής καὶ ἡ γῆ σὺν τῷ ὑγρῷ φύσει καὶ ὁ οὐρανός, ἀλλοτριολογεῖν ἀν
δόξειεν. No greater change is required than καταδεικνύει.

ii. 1. 18. οὗτος δὲ Πυθέα πιστεύων κατὰ τὰ τυπιώτερα τῆς Βρεταννικῆς
τὴν οἰκησιν ταύτην τίθησι. All editors agree that the context requires the
opposite word. But to substitute τὰ ἀρκτικώτερα is out of the question.
Read τὰ ἀνώτερα (or rather τὰν ὀτερα, which was misdivided).

iii. 2. 7. καὶ οἱ θύννοι δὲ σπέρματα συνεγγίζουσι ταῖς Στήλαις ἔκθεν
φερόμενοι, τοσφόι ἵσχνανται πλείον, τῆς τροφῆς ἐπιλειπούσης εἶναι τε παρὰ
θαλάττιον ὥν τὸ ζυον τοῦτο. εἶναι has no construction and παρὰ no sense.
παρὰ is a misreading of the compendium for παροιμία: 'it is a saying
that this creature is the sea-pig'. The saying is known from Athenaeus.
See Kramer here.

iii. 2. 8. τὸν μὲν ἄργυρον ἀποκαίσθαι τὸν δὲ χρυσὸν ὑπομένειν εὐδιάχυτος
γάρ τὸ τύπος καὶ λιθώδης. Coraës reads λιπώδης. For the rest, ὁ τύπος is
regarded as desperate. Read εὐδιάχυτος γάρ τὸ ὑφος . . . It is easily
fused as to its 'texture'.

iii. 3. 3. ὦ δὴ καὶ τὸν Ἀριστοτέλη φησὶν ὁ Ποσειδώνιος οὐκ ὄρθως αἰτιάσθαι
τὴν παραλίαν καὶ τὴν Μαυρονοίαν τῶν πλημμυρίδων καὶ τῶν ἀμπτάτεων παλιρροεῖν
γάρ φάναι τὴν θάλατταν διὰ τὸ τὰς ἄκρας ὑψηλὰς τε καὶ τραχείας εἶναι, δεχομένας

τε τὸ κῦμα σκληρῶς καὶ ἀνταποδιδούσας τῷ τὸν Ιβηρίᾳ. It is admitted that Ιβηρίᾳ is nonsense. The copyist is engaged in writing about Ιβηρίᾳ and it is natural that he should make this mistake for . . . καὶ ἀνταποδιδούσας τῷ ἵση βίᾳ. The earlier corruption in the passage may be emended with . . . τὴν Ιβηρικὴν παραδιάν.

iv. 4. 5. πρόσεστι δὲ τῇ ἀνοίᾳ καὶ τῷ βάρβαρον καὶ τῷ ἔκφυλον, ὃ τοῖς προσβόρροις ἔθνεσι παρακλούσθει πλείστον, τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς μάχης ἀπιόντας τὰς κεφαλὰς τῶν πολεμίων ἔξαπτεν ἐκ τῶν αἰχένων τῶν ἵππων, κομίσαντας δὲ προσπατταλείεν τὴν τέθεν τοῖς προπυλαίοις. Read τὴν θύραν. (Cf. the ἄγρα of Agave in the *Bacchae*.)

v. 2. 5. μεταξὺ δὲ Λοίνης καὶ Πίστης ὁ Μάκρης ἐστὶ τὸ χωρίον, ὃ πέρατι τῆς Τυρρηνίας καὶ τῆς Αιγαίου κέχρηνται. The conjectures ποτάμου (Kramer), χειμάρρου (Madvig), are scarcely so near as χαράδριον.

v. 3. 1. ἔστρωται δὲ δί' αὐτῶν ἡ Σαλαρία ὡδὸς οὐ τὸπολλὴ οὐσα. Kramer rightly objects to this as contrary to the fact. Nor is the word suitable. Read οὐ φαύλη.

v. 4. 13. ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον γύρῳ τεῦ ἐτρύφησαν, ὥστ' ἐπὶ δεῖπνον ἐκάλουν πρὸς ζεύγη μονομάχων. Read ἐξετρύφησαν.

vi. 1. 1. ἐπετέθεν δὲ ἐκπλέοντι τὸν πόντον νῆσος Λευκωσία. Both geography and expression require . . . ἐκπλέοντι πρὸς νότον . . .

vi. 3. 1. ἔστι δὲ τέπιχερρονησίαζοντα ἡ Μεσσαπία. Read νποχ. It is 'rather peninsular'.

vi. 3. 2. A conspiracy has been formed—τούτων δὲ καὶ Φάλανθος, δότερος ἐδίκει προστάτης ὑπάρχειν δύτῶν, οὐκ ἡρέσκετο δὲ ἀπλῶς τοῖς περὶ τῆς Βουλῆς τὸνομασθεῖσι. Madvig's δογματισθεῖσι is remote, and the νομισθεῖσι of Coraes is weak. Read συνομοσθεῖσι.

x. 1. 15. τῶν δὲ ἐκ Τροίας ἐτανόντων Εὐβόέων τινὲς εἰς Ιλλυρίους ἐπεσόντες, τὸ Αβαντες οὐκαδὲ διὰ τῆς Μακεδονίας περὶ ἕδεσσαν ἔμειναν. Read ἄραντες. They 'started'.

x. 3. 8. ἡ δὲ ἐνόπλιος ὅρχησις στρατιωτική, ταῦτα ἡ πυρρίχη δῆλοι καὶ ὁ Πύρριχος, ὃν φασι εὐρετὴν εἶναι τῆς τοιωτῆς ἀσκήσεως τῶν νέων ταῦτα στρατιωτικά. The sense required is in the first place *⟨ws⟩* καὶ ἡ πυρρίχη . . . , and in the second καινοῦντα τὰ στρατιωτικά.

xii. 2. 6. ἐντάθι δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ στενώτατος πορθμὸς τοῦ στόματος τῆς Μαιωτίδος, ὃν εἴκοσι σταδίων ἡ πλειόνων, ἔχων ἐν τῷ περαίᾳ κάμην τὸ Μυρικίου. πλησίον δὲ ἐστὶ τοῦ τὸν Ἡρακλείου καὶ τὸ Παρθένιον. As τὸ Ἡρακλεῖον has not been mentioned, not only is its introduction abrupt, but καὶ has no meaning. Read τοῦ κλειθροῦ, i.e. the said narrowest part of the entrance.

xii. 5. 1. They say of the Amazons that they live τὸν μὲν ἄλλον χρόνον

καθ' αὐτὰ

τὸν νομά

πλεονήσε

Read τῶ

xi.

σχήματι

τὸν αὐτὸ

δὲ αὐτὸ

xi.

τοῦ μὲν ε

I am co

representa

may rest

xii.

τύπονομο

after the

PLU

Πλαθαύρο

περιγεγο

καταφρο

emend t

σεωὶ κ

nor does

should re

διώκοντες.

Mo

πόρρωθεν

ἀγοστα τ

καταδραμ

I should

Mo

πυθόμενος

τὴν ἐλε

the exten

Mo

πλατ

τὸν

EMENDATIONS IN STRABO AND PLUTARCH'S MORALIA 101

καθ' αὐτὰς αὐτουργούσας ἔκαστα, τά τε πρὸς ἄροτρον καὶ φυτουργίαν καὶ τὰ πρὸς τὰς νομάς, καὶ μάλιστα τῶν ἵππων, τὰς δὲ ἀλκιμωτάτας τῶν ἵππων κυνηγείας πλεονάζειν καὶ τὰ ποδέμια ἀσκεῖν. Some MSS give ἐφ' ἵππων for τῶν ἵππων. Read τῶν ἐφ' ἵππων.

xii. 6. 3. φῆθισταν καὶ αὐτοὶ παρέξεσθαι τὴν γραφὴν ἡδεῖαν, ἐὰν ἐν ἴστορίᾳ σχῆματι λέγωσιν ἀ μηδέποτε εἶδον μήτε ἡκουσαν, ή οὐ παρά γε εἰδότων, σκοποῦντες τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ μόνον τοῦτο, ὅτι ἀκρόστιν ἡδεῖαν ἔχει καὶ θαυμαστήν. Read σκοποῦντες δὲ αὐτὸν δὴ μόνον τοῦτο, ὅτι κ.τ.λ.

xii. 7. 2. καὶ τὸδιὰ τὸ μὲν εἶδος τῆς εὐδαιμονίας σημεῖα ἡγοῦνται. al. καὶ τὸν μὲν εἶδος, or καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τοῦ εἶδος. The words are without meaning. I am convinced that τὸν μὲν εἶδος contains τοῦ μεγέθους and that διὰ represents <νὴ> Δία. Accepting the conjecture διηγοῦνται (see Kramer) we may restore καὶ <νὴ> Δία τοῦ μεγέθους τῆς εὐδαιμονίας σημεῖα <δι>ηγοῦνται.

xii. 8. 19. ἡ δὲ μεταξὺ Λαοδικείας καὶ Ἀπαμείας λίμνη καὶ βορβορόδι καὶ τύπονομον τὴν ἀποφορὰν ἔχει. Read καὶ <καθ> ὑπόνομον. It has a smell after the manner of a sewer.

II. PLUTARCH'S MORALIA (Bernardakis' text).

PLUTARCH *Mor.* 44 B πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν οἱ κακῶς καὶ παρὰ μέλος τὴν Πιθαγόρου φωνὴν ὑπόλαμβάνοντες. ἕκεῖνος μὲν γάρ ἐκ φιλοσοφίας ἔφησεν αὐτῷ περιγεγονέναι τὸ μηδὲν θαυμάζειν οὐτοὶ δὲ τὸ μηδὲν ἐπαινεῖν μηδὲ τιμᾶν, ἐν τῷ καταφρονεῖντι τιθέμενοι καὶ τὸ σεμνὸν ὑπεροφήλια διώκοντες. Bernardakis would emend the last clause by transposing καὶ, thus, ἐν τῷ καταφρονεῖν τιθέμενοι τὸ σεμνὸν καὶ ὑπεροφήλια διώκοντες. The corruption does not appear very probable, nor does the language as emended sound to me very much like Plutarch. I should read ἐν τῷ καταφρονεῖν <τὸ φρονεῖν> τιθέμενοι καὶ τὸ σεμνὸν ὑπεροφήλια διώκοντες.

Mor. 160 F (The dolphins bearing Arion are approaching the coast.) πόρρωθεν ἀφεωράτο φρίκη κατιούσα παρὰ τὴν ἄκραν, ἀφρόν τινα καὶ φόρον ἄγουστα τῷ ρόθιῳ περὶ αὐτὴν πολὺν, ὥστε πάντας ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον οἱ προσέμελλε καταδραμεῖν θαυμάσαντας. The correction προσβάλλειν ἔμελλε lacks neatness. I should prefer προσέκελλε.

Mor. 221 C Ἡρώνδας, Ἀθήνησιν ἀλόντος τινὸς γραφὴν ἀργίας, παρὼν καὶ πυθόμενος ἐκέλευσεν ἐπιδεῖξαι αὐτῷ τὸν τὴν τελευθερίαν δίκην ἡττηθέντα. Read τὴν ἐλευθερίας δίκην. He was charged with being a 'gentleman' (at least to the extent of living a free life).

Mor. 223 E σοφιστοῦ δέ τινος περὶ ἀνδρείας λέγοντος, πλειόν ἐγέλασε. Read πλατανὸν ἐγέλασε.

Mor. 233 D ἐπαινοῦντός τινος τοὺς ἀρίστους μαχητάς, Δάκων εἶπεν 'ἐν Τροίᾳ'.
Read ἐπαινοῦντός τινος τοὺς <Αργείους ὡς ὅντας> ἀρίστους κ.τ.λ.

Mor. 234 D Σπαρτάτης ἐρωτηθεὶς εἰ ἀσφαλής ἡ εἰς Σπάρτην ὁδὸς εἰπεῖ
'ὅποις καθίστης' οἱ μὲν γὰρ λέοντες βαδίζοντι δῆτα καὶ λέωντι, τῷς δὲ λαγός ἐπὶ^{τὰ} σκηνὴν θηρεύομες'. Read ὅποιός καὶ τις ὁς and ἐπὶ τὰς κηνὰς (i.e. κενῆς).
'That depends upon the sort of man you are; for lions walk where they choose, but for hares we hunt upon empty (i.e. no man's) land (i.e. you will only find them there, they dare not venture anywhere else).'

Mor. 241 C A Spartan mother lost her son in battle, and when an old woman condoled with her, exclaiming ὡ γύναι, τὰς τύχας, she replied νὴ τὸ σιώ, ἀλλὰ τὰς καλὰς γέ ταὶ καὶ γάρ αὐτὸν ὥν ἔνεκεν ἔτεκον, ὥν ὑπέρ τὰς Σπάρτας ἀποθάνη, τοῦτό μοι συνέβη. Bernardakis should not have altered ὥν to οὐ. The correct form, as shown by the corruption also, is ω. Read also ναὶ τὸ σιώ, γα, and συνέβα.

Mor. 335 B Λιούπιπον δὲ τὸν τὸν πρῶτον Ἀλέξανδρον πλάσαντος, ἄνω βλέποντα κ.τ.λ. Bernardakis notes 'πρῶτον del. Abreschius'. A simple solution, but scarcely satisfactory. Read τὸν κριωτὸν Ἀλέξανδρον (i.e. Alexander 'with the ram's horns').

Mor. 616 F (Of the abolition of precedence at a banquet.) εἰ δὲ περὶ τᾶλλα τὴν ἴστορη τοῖς ἀνδράσι φυλάξουμεν, τί οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν ἀρξαμενοὶ πρῶτον ἔθιζομεν ἀτύφως καὶ ἀφελῶς κατακλίνεσθαι μετ' ἀλλιῆλων, εἰθὺς απὸ τῶν θυρῶν ὄρωντας, ὅτι τὸ δημοκρίτος ἐπὶ τὸ δεῖπνον καὶ οὐκ ἔξαιρετον ὡς . . . πόλιν, ἐφ' οὐ κατακλίθεις ὁ πλούσιος τὸν τὴν κατακλίσει τοῖς εὐτελεστάτοις; This very corrupt passage can, I think, be emended with more certainty than most others. For δημοκρίτος Turnebus gave δημοκρατιῶς, which, however, is less near than δημοτικῶς. For ἐτὶ read ἔξει (i.e. εξι). ἐφ' οὐ (cf. 619 B) shows that τόπον was in the sentence (cf. 619 E τοῦτον ἔξαιρετον ἔξει τὸν τόπον). For ἐν τῇ κατακλίσει (which is in any case intolerable after κατακλίθεις) read ἐγκαταχλιδήσει. Since the superlative and comparative compendia are constantly confused we need feel no scruple in restoring εὐτελεστέροις. The passage may now read εἰθὺς ἀπὸ τῶν θυρῶν ὄρωντας, ὅτι δημοτικῶς ἔξει τὸ δεῖπνον καὶ οὐκ ἔξαιρετον δώσει τις τόπον, ἐφ' οὐ κατακλίθεις ὁ πλούσιος ἐγκαταχλιδήσει τοῖς εὐτελεστέροις.

Mor. 645 A καὶ Ὁμηρος εἰπών

οὐδὲ τραπεζη

γνώτην ἀλλιῆλων

δῆλος ἔστιν εἰδὼς τὸ νον τοῦ οἴνου καὶ τὸ πολλῶν γόνιμον. The first lacuna is of 12 or 13 letters, the second of 5 or 6. Read δῆλος ἔστιν εἰδὼς τὸ <παρησταζόμεν> νον τοῦ οἴνου καὶ <λαλιῶν> ἀπλῶν γόνιμον.

EM
αλλ' ἐτέ
γονῆς τὸ

Μα
γναζίν
Bernard
ραστο
towards

Μα
ωτὸς ἑα
τὰς
διλγόνος

Melbo

EMENDATIONS IN STRABO AND PLUTARCH'S MORALIA 103

Mor. 718 A οὐδὲν οἴομαι δεινόν, εἰ μὴ πλησιάζων ὁ θεός, ὥσπερ ἀνθρώπος, ἀλλ' ἔτεραι τισὶν ἀφαῖς δὲ ἔτέρων καὶ ψαύσεσι τρέπει καὶ ὑποπίμπλησι θειοτέρας γονῆς τὸ θυητόν. Probably περιέπει.

Mor. 752 D 'Δέγω τοινν' ὁ Πεισίας ἔφη 'προκηρύξεις ἐμοῦ γ' ἔνεκα πάταις γνωμένην τὸν ἔραστην, ὅτι τῆς γνωμής ὁ πλοῦτος ἔστι φιλακτέος τῷ νεανίσκῳ. Bernardakis remarks 'quid lateat, incertum'. Surely ἀνεραστίαν, cf. ἀνεραστος *supra*. For his part Peisias makes proclamation of that attitude towards women.

Mor. 865 B ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τοῦ πιθανοῦ τῆς διαβολῆς ἐφρόντισεν, οὐδὲ ὅπως ἀντὶς ἁυτῷ τάνατίᾳ λέγων τὸ παρ' ὀλίγους ἀνθρώπους οὐ φανεῖται συνειδάς. Read . . . τάνατίᾳ λέγων παραλόγως κανοήτως . . . The corruption to παρ' ὀλίγους made that of ἀνοίτως almost inevitable.

T. G. TUCKER.

Melbourne, Nov. 1, 1907.

εν 'ἐν Τροίᾳ'.
τ.λ.
ν ὁδὸς ἐπει
εἰς λαγὼς ἐπει
ς (i.e. κενῆς).
where they
i.e. you will
when an old
replied νὴ τῷ
τρᾶς Σπάρτας
to ὁ. The
ναι τῷ σιά,

νῳ βλέποντα
solution, but
ander 'with

εἰ δὲ περὶ¹
ενοὶ πρότον
· τῶν θυρῶν
πόλιντ, ἐφ
This very
than most
ever, is less
(cf. 619 B)
τὸν ἔξει τὸν
κατακλιθεῖς)
compendia
τελεστέρους.
η μοτικῶς
απακλιθεῖς ὁ

. . . τὸ πολλῶν
τὸ 6. Read
ν> ἀπλῶν

NOTES ON THE PHILOSTRATI.

FOR the following notes, which are mainly on the *Life of Apollonius*, I have taken Kayser's Teubner text (1870) as the foundation, and my references are to the Olearius paging in his margin.

2 ἐπήσκητο.

There is no reason for the pluperfect. The tense should be imperfect, ἐπησκέιτο, like those before and after.

7 (end) προίων δ' ἐς ἡλικίαν ἐν ὑ γράμματα.

Some verb, e.g. ἐμάνθανε, seems missing in the relative clause.

9 Birds can be trained to say χαῖρε etc. οὐτε εἰδότες ὅτι λέγοντιν οὐτε διακείμενοι πρὸς τὰς ἀνθράπους.

One would think that an adverb must have gone with διακείμενοι. It might be something significant, like φιλικῶς, or something slight and neutral, like πως, which would easily fall out before πρός.

10 ποιεῖται and ἀμπίσχεται ought, I think, to be imperfects. They have imperfects all about them, and such historical presents do not seem to occur in the text, or to be suitable.

17 αὐτὸν γε μὴν τὸν χρόνον ἀγίρω τε καὶ ἀθάνατον παρὰ τῆς μνημοσύνης εἶναι. Evidently παρὰ τὴν μνημοσύνην by reason of memory.

ibid. ἀν πρὸς ἄνδρα ἴδωσιν, ἐρυθρῶσι.

Not if they see a man, that is, any man; but only if he is a *vir pietatis gravis*. Some adjective is missing, or perhaps disguised in πρὸς. πρεσβύτερον?

27 πάλαι γάρ σε ἡκούομεν.

Read ἀκούομεν.

54 Some points of physical science may perhaps be studied best on mountains, but neither Athos nor Olympus will help you in moral and theological questions, εἰ μὴ διορῷ αὐτὰ ἡ ψυχή, ἣν εἰ καθαρὰ καὶ ἀκήρατος αὐτῶν ἀπτοτο πολλῷ μεῖζον ἔγωγ' ἀν φάινεν τοντονὶ τοῦ Καυκάσου.

The general meaning must be that the mind will go further, higher, than any mountain. ἀπτεν, used of rapid motion, the swiftness of thought, is no doubt right enough, though its implied application to the Caucasus rising into the air is a little strange. But ought not μεῖζον to be μᾶστον, *further* or *higher*,

not greater
confusion o

66 (end)

Perhaps

79 (end)

ἐν for

81 πα

This

genitive, εγ

83 (end)

εὐδαιμονεστ

and has no

96 οὐ

104

Read

that is less

105

χυστένους *

A ren

substituted

on by οὐδέ

with the s

and antith

δ Δάμας ἐ

have in 19

Τ. τετμήσ

μᾶλλον δέ

With

γάρ for ή

110

έγι, έφη,

We

οὐτε ξυμ

μένος αὐτ

πρεσβύτερ

111

Then

in the ra

not *greater*? I have suggested a similar change in *Xen. Mem.* 4.7. 10, and the confusion of *μᾶλλον*, *μᾶσσον*, and *μέγιστος*, *μίκιστος* occurs, I think, elsewhere.

66 (end) *ζούκας* . . . *μεταγράφειν* τὸ *ιαμβεῖον*.

Perhaps *μεταγράψειν*.

79 (end) *ἐπειδὴν* ἐς τοῦ βασιλέως πίνωσιν.

ἐν for ἐς?

81 πόθεν οὗτος ἔχεις φωνῆς Ἐλλάδος;

This may be right, but it looks as though an adverb governing the genitive, e.g. *ἐμπειρός*, was lost.

83 (end) *πλειόνων* δὲ η ἐγώ ἄρχει καὶ εὐδάίμων η χόρα παρὰ πολὺ τῆς ἐνταῦθα. *εὐδαιμονεστέρα* or *εὐδάίμων* (*μᾶλλον*) is required. *παρὰ πολὺ* is only *by much*, and has not in itself any comparative force.

96 οὗτ' *⟨ἄν⟩* νοοῦσαι . . . οὗτ' ἄν τρωθεὶς ἀλγῆσαι.

104 νομίζειν 'Ἐλληνικοῖς ἥθεσι.

Read *ἥθεσι*. So in 172 we ought perhaps to read *ἀδικῶν περὶ τὰ ἥθη*, but that is less clear.

105 εἶδον . . . οἰκοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ οὐκ ἐπ' αὐτῆς καὶ ἀτειχίστως τετειχισμένους καὶ οὐδὲν κεκτημένους η τὰ πάτων.

A remarkably clear case, though the editors strangely fail to see it, of η substituted by confusion for καὶ. The contradictions must of course be carried on by οὐδὲν κεκτημένους καὶ τὰ πάτων. The same sentence, εἶδον κ.τ.λ. occurs with the same uncorrected blunder in 245. Yet in 106 we have the true sense and antithesis given in the phrase τὸ δὲ μηδὲν κεκτημένους τὰ πάτων ἔχειν ὡς ο Δάμις ἔξηγεται κ.τ.λ. Through similar corruption and want of perception we have in 194 τὸ τετμήσεσθαι τὸν Ἰσθμὸν η οὐ τετμήσεσθαι, in spite of 163 τὸ τὸν Ί. τετμήσεσθαι καὶ οὐ τετμήσεσθαι, and of 162 οὗτος ο αὐχὴν τῆς γῆς τετμήσεται, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐ.

With these examples before us we need not hesitate much in reading καὶ γάρ for η γάρ in 6.

110 τίνα θαυμασιώτερον ηγῆ τῶν ἐπὶ Τροίαν τε καὶ ὑπὲρ Τροίας ἐλθόντων; ηγώ, ἔφη, Ἀχιλλέα.

We should read no doubt *τίνα θαυμασιότατον*. In 241, on the contrary, οὐτε ξυμβούλους ίμᾶς βίου ποιησόμενος ηκω . . . πρεοβίτατός τε ίμῶν . . . ἀφιγμένος αὐτὸς ἀν μᾶλλον εἰκότως ξυνεβούλευον ίμίν, it is equally clear that we need πρεοβίτερος.

111 φάσμα . . . προϊόντας αὐτὸν ηλανεν ἐνταραττόμενον τῷ ὄμιλῳ.

There is no meaning in *ἐνταραττόμενον*. *ἐνταττόμενον* τῷ ὄμιλῳ *appearing in the ranks?* In *Plato Laws* 797 Ε *ταχθέντα* is a variant for *ταραχθέντα*.

ibid. τὸ δὲ πορθεῖν πόλεις ὅστις εὐκλεέστερον ἡγεῖται τοῦ ἀνοικίζειν πόλιν οὐκ ἔστι.

It is difficult to believe that, according to the writer, no one (*οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις*) thought this. It has always been the idea of the mass of men. Is some predicate to *οὐκ ἔστι* lost? A dozen might be suggested.

115 καὶ λαμπρύνοντες αὐτοὺς ἐπαίνοις οἰσπερ τὰ ἀνδράποδα ἡγιατοὺς πέμπετε. Perhaps *σίουισπερ*, or *〈τοῖς αὐτοῖς〉* (lost after *αὐτοὺς*) ἐπαίνοις οἰσπερ.

116 οὐν ἐβονιόμην ἄν μᾶλλον λίμνην αὐτῷ περιβλύσαι *〈ποιησαι〉* νέκταρος? *περιβλύσαι* is intransitive.

118 (end) ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐς ἄνδρας ἔξαλλάττεις ηδη (are growing a man), φειδώμεθα τῶν ἀνοίτων καὶ εὐκόλων.

εὐκόλων is mere nonsense in this context. Probably *εὐτελῶν*. Menander has ἐγὼ δὲ ἀνόητος εὐτελῆς ὑπερβολῆ (M. 4. 266: K. 3. 185).

119 (init.) ἐμοὶ δῆ, not δέ.

140 ἐφοίτων . . . ξένον τε αὐτὸν ἡγούμενοι καὶ βίον ἔνιμβολον βωμῶν τε ιδρύσεως καὶ ἀγαλμάτων. By a mistake which is found elsewhere (cf. a suggestion of mine on Herod. 6. 52) *ἡγούμενοι* has been written, I should say, for *ποιούμενοι*. Cf. 147 *ιατρὸν ποιούμενοι αὐτὸν τὸν πάθος*: 171 *ξένον τε παρὰ τῷ Δίῳ ἐποιούντο . . . βίον τε νομοθέτην*: 178 *ἡγεμόνας αὐτοὺς ποιεῖσθαι*. The word *ἡγούμενοι* is even less appropriate to *καὶ . . . ἀγαλμάτων* than to *ξένοι*.

142 ἀστείαν καὶ τρυφήν can hardly be predicates of *ἐκείνον*. An infinitive to govern them is missing.

145 He said a beautiful city was like the Zeus of Phidias, *καθῆσθαι γὰρ αὐτὸν* (the statue)—*οὔτως τῷ δημιουργῷ ἔδοξε* τοὺς δὲ ἄνδρας ἐπὶ πάντα ἥκοντας μηδὲν ἀποικεῖν τοῦ Ὄμηρεον Διός, δις κ.τ.λ.

The point is the fixity and immobility of the one, the freedom and movement of the other. But *οὔτως . . . ἔδοξε* gives poor sense, and the words are hardly grammatical, for *ἔδοξε* should be *δόξαι*. Both faults are cured together, if we add *ως* after the last letters of *οὔτως* and read *καθῆσθαι γὰρ οὔτως 〈ως〉 τῷ δημιουργῷ ἔδοξε*.

146 (end) ἡ περὶ αὐτοῖς (not *αὐτοῖς*) εὐβονλία.

148 (end) τὸν τε Φοίνικα τροφέα καὶ ὄπαδὸν καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα τιμῶν ἐνδιμίζεν.

Kayser *τιμῶν ἐνδιμίζεν*, which I have difficulty in translating. It is pretty clear that *τιμῶν ἀνόμαζεν* is what Philostratus wrote. The parts of *νομίζω* and *δονομάζω* are, it is well known, often confused.

163 (init.) Write δέ for τε after *κομίζοιντο*.

169 *κρινεῖσθαι*, not *κρίνεσθαι*.

171
Is ἔφι

189
μοι is
will then
writer's o
ἔνιμβαίνο

193
τὸν Δελφο
μαστιγώσε
(Cf. t
certamine

The
naturally
out, ὡς 〈δ
thought o

Imm
πότερα Ξ
word or
πρύγματα

197
again sub

198
Perha
ἐπιανοῦσι

214
τοῦ ξην?

216
διαβάλλω
274
δῆτι μηδε

ibid.

The
the verb

287
Read οὐ

288

ν πόλιν οὐκ
στιν ὅστις)
Is some
ν πέμπετε.
νέκταρος?
, φειδώμεθα
nander has

βωμῶν τε
ere (cf. a
should say,
ξένον τε
ποιεῖσθαι
than to

a infinitive
ηῆθαι γὰρ
τα ἥκοντας

edom and
the words
are cured
ηῆθαι γὰρ

is pretty
ομίζει
ν ἐνόμιζεν.

171 ναὶ τῷ σιώ, ἔφη.
Is ἔφη for ἔφη τις (?) right?

189 δοκῶ μοι τὸν Ἀπολλώνιον ἐπεσκέφθαι τὸ ὄν.
μοι is meaningless here, and should perhaps be μέν. πιστοῦται δὲ κτλ. will then correspond to it. If, as appears to be the case, πιστοῦται is the writer's own addition (otherwise we should have πιστοῦσθαι and ἀποδείπειν), ξυμβαίνοι must be read for ξυμβαίνειν.

193 Nero performing in Greece λεαίνων τὴν φωνὴν καὶ δεδιὼς τὸν Ἡλείον ὃ τὸν Δελφόν, ἢ μὴ δεδιὼς μέν, κακός δὲ οὖτος ὑποκρινόμενος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τέχνην ὡς μὴ παστιγώσθειν νομίζειν πρὸς τούτων ὃν αὐτὸς ἄρχειν τέτακται.
(Cf. the picture in Suetonius *Nero* 24 *parvidus et metuens ne ob delictum certamine summoveretur.*)

The words ὡς μὴ μ. ν. seem to give the very opposite sense to what we naturally look for, 'so badly as *not* to be scourged.' Can a ὅστον have dropped out, ὡς οὕτοις μὴ μ. ν., 'so badly as just to escape a scourging'? I have also thought of *μεμαστιγώσθειν*, but the sense would be odd.

Immediately afterwards τοῖς δὲ Ἐλλησι τίνα (=πότερον) ἡγῆ, ὡς Μένιππε; πότερα Ξέρεην καταπιμπάντα ἢ Νέρωνα ἄδοντα; seems to lack a predicative word or phrase to go with τίνα ἡγῆ, e.g. φοβεράτερον, οτ πλείω παρέχειν πράγματα.

197 A word or words also lost with τρεῖς 'Ρωμαίων αὐτοκράτορες, which is again subject without predicate. So in 206 οὐ πάντες is incomplete.

198 ἔστι τι μυθολογία; Νὴ Δ!', εἶπεν ὁ Μένιππος, ἦν γε οἱ ποιηταὶ ἐπαινοῦσι. Perhaps ἐπασκοῦσι. Cf. 1 above and also 3 σοφίας ἦν . . . ἐπήσκησεν. ἐπαινοῦσι is senseless.

214 ὡς ὑπὸ γυναιών ἡττηθεὶς ἐπελάθετο <οὐ μόνον> τοῦ ἄρχειν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ ἔντονος?

216 (end) βελτίων ἀν ἦν should be β. ἀν ἥσθα.

241 ἐν Πιθαγόρου. Surely Πιθαγόρα, unless anything is omitted.

251 ἐπεὶ δὲ πιθανὸς ὑμᾶς ἔδοξε τούμον διαβάλλειν ἥθος. πιθανὸς or διαβάλλων.

274 (end) 'ἐγώ δέ . . . οὕτω ἔγνων οὐρανοῦ προγενεστέρους ἀστέρας,' διδάσκων ὅτι μηδὲ ἀν γένοντό τι τοῦ ἐν φί φίσται μὴ ὄντος. Read φίσται.

ibid. καθίεντος ἐς αὐτὸν ὑποψίας, ὑφ' ὅν διειστήκεσαν ἐκκλησιαζομένη πόλις.

The last words, as they stand, are unintelligible. But the last letters of the verb suggest a remedy. Should it not run διειστήκεσαν <ὡς ἀ> ἐ. πόλις?

287 (init.) ἐδίδαξαν ὑμᾶς φόην Μοῦσαι μήτω ἐς δίκας ἢ διαβολὰς ὑπαχθεῖσαν. Read ὑπαχθεῖσαι.

288 ὁ μηδέ should be ὁ μηδέ.

310 αὐτοῦ τε γὰρ τοῦ σχήματος (ένεκα)? ἀπεβλέπετο . . . καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ οἶκεν ὑπὲρ ἀνδρῶν κινδυνεύοντα καὶ τοὺς βασκαίνοντας αὐτῷ πρότερον ἐπιτηδείους ἔποιει.

ἀνδρῶν can hardly be right. Either add something to it or read ἄλλων.
In Plut. *Mor.* 603 B ἄλλων is a mistake for the Homeric ἀνδρῶν.

323 Σωκράτην . . . ὅτε ἔφυγε τὴν γραφήν. Read ἔφευγε. ἔφυγε would mean was acquitted. So in *Heroicus* 660 read γραφήν ἐκεῖ ἄν τις, οἷμαι, φεύγοι (not φύγοι) μὴ τρυφῶν.

324 ἥδη μέτρει, βασιλεῦ, ὅδωρ' εἰ γὰρ ἔνγχωρίστεις αὐτῷ μῆκος λόγων, ἀπάγξει ημᾶς.

Cobet θέλει for ἀπάγξει, but the words are very unlike. By the omission of one letter we can get ἀπάξει, which seems suitable enough: e.g. cf. Dem. 19. 242 ἐαν ἱμᾶς ἀπαγάγη τῷ λόγῳ and τοὺς δικαστὰς ἀπαγάγων ἀπὸ τῆς ὑποθέσεως. In Plut. *Demetr.* 5 πορθεῖν Συρίαν καὶ τὰς πόλεις ἀπάγειν καὶ βιάζεσθαι. Madvig's ἀπάγχειν may be right.

328 ὡς μὴ τὸ εὐθὺ ἔχούσης. Rather ἔξωσης.

359 (end) ἀκροάστεσθαι should be ἀκροάστεσθαι. So too 312 (end).

I add a very few notes on the other writings.

LIVES OF SOPHISTS.

479 πατέρας δὲ οὐ προσέγραψα, μὰ Δί', οὐ πᾶσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀπ' εὐδοκίμων. Punctuate μὰ Δί' οὐ, πᾶσιν. Otherwise οὐ could not well be repeated.

ibid. οἶδα γὰρ δὴ καὶ Κριτίαν τὸν σοφιστὴν οὐκ ἐκ πατέρων (ἀρξάμενον), ἀλλ' Όμηρον δὴ μάνον σὺν τῷ πατρὶ ἐπιμησθέντα?

500 καὶ οἱ τύρανοι δὲ αἰρετώτεροι τοῖς ἀρχομένοις ἀνεμένοι μᾶλλον η̄ ἔντεινοντες εἰ γὰρ ἀνήσουσιν, ἥττον μὲν ἀποκτενούσιν, ἥττον δὲ δράσοντά τε καὶ ἀρπάσονται.

δράσονται is a *vox nihili*. Perhaps it represents διασπάσονται, *ρ* and *ι* being exchanged, as often, and the repetition of *ασ* leading to loss. But I am not quite sure that διασπᾶν gives a good meaning here, for its sense is not *plunder* but *rend in pieces, divide*, etc. If we could run the two futures into one and read διαρπάσονται, we should get a quite appropriate word.

ἀνεμένοι ought, I think, to be ἀνέμενοι, matching ἔντεινοντες. The two forms are often confused. Thus in Clem. Alex. *Paedagog.* 3. 11. 74 it should be ἀνεμένα (not ἀνέμενα) τὰ τοῦ σώματος μέλη, to match the perfects καθειμένη etc. preceding.

576 (end) Ἐλλησπόντῳ γῆν ὀλίγην ἐπιβαλὼν ταύτην οἴει σοι μένειν.
Obviously μενεῖν.

580 (init.) ἀξιούντα κατηγορεῖν τοῦ μὲν Δημοσθένους Μηδισμοῦ, τοῦ δὲ Αἰσχίνου Φιλιππισμοῦ.

Read Μηδισμόν . . . Φιλιππισμόν. So in *Letter* 40 κατηγορεῖ δὲ καὶ γῆρας τοῦ προσώπου.

603
Ἐλευσῖν.
Before
510 λόγοι
we have t

605
Read
τέπτασι τ
This
No error

662
καὶ μ. δ.

682 (τοῦ "Εκτο
αὐτὰ μηδ
εὶ μὴ
very fast
It would
<πλὴν> εὶ

It is
another t
words qu
some ear

705 (ταῖσαντας
perhaps h
been int
suppose a
... οῖοι

722
φανεῖ.
(D. Hal.

726
oftener t
has ὅμοι

In t
of p. 364
στενὴ οὐσ

603 ἐκτήσατο δὲ καὶ οἰκίας, δύο μὲν ἐν ἀστεῖ, μίαν δὲ ἐν Πειραιεῖ καὶ ἄλλην Ελευσίνι.

Before the δ of δύο I suspect another δ=τέτταρας has been lost. So in 510 λόγοι δ' Αἰσχίνου κατ' ἐνίους μὲν καὶ τέταρτος it has been pointed out that we have to add a γ=τρεις (λόγοι δ' Αἰσχίνου γ' κατ' ἐνίους μὲν καὶ τέταρτος).

605 μὴ ἀπείναι τοῦ ιέρου τοὺς θεραπεύοντας.

Read θεραπεύοντας, comparing 703 ἔρμους τῶν θεραπευσόντων, 716 ὅτι μὴ πέπασι τὸν θεραπεύοντα, etc. The future is regular.

This makes the fifth correction of present to future in these few notes. No error is commoner.

HEROICVS.

662 Add ἄν to καὶ κάρια δοίην καὶ μῆλα δοίην. Possibly καὶ κάρια δ' ἄν καὶ μ. δ., for the repetition of δοίην seems to lack point.

682 (end) περὶ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ Πάριδος οὐδὲ ἀκούειν ἀξιῶ οὐδέν . . . , περὶ δὲ τοῦ "Εκτορος" . . . οὐδὲ ἄν ἐρούμην γέ τι οὐδὲ ἄν ἀκούσαμε χαίρων, εἰ μὴ διαπηδώντις αὐτὸς μηδὲ ἀμελῶς λέγοις.

εἰ μὴ κ.τ.λ. is quite absurd. 'I should not care to listen, unless you went very fast and carelessly.' Of course we want the opposite, not *unless* but *if*. It would be awkward to double the μή (εἰ μὴ <μὴ> διαπηδώντις), and therefore <πλὴν> εἰ μή seems not unlikely, or εἰ μὴ <μήτε> . . . μήτε . . .

It is not a bad instance of the carelessness with which editors follow one another that both Kayser (1870) and Westermann (Didot 1878) give these words quite erroneously as a question. The mistake was probably made in some earlier text, which they reproduce.

705 (end) διδώσων ὑμίν ἔνυμιν ἔνυμάχους ἔκατὸν πόλεις καὶ ὡς τὴν Τροίαν ἔδειν παιζόντας. καί is unmeaning. It is sometimes confused with ὡς, and has perhaps here been repeated from it by accident: that is, one compendium has been interpreted twice over, once as καί and again as ὡς. The alternative is to suppose an omission, e.g. καὶ <τροιόντος> ὡς. Cf. a little below: τοιούτοι ἔσμεν . . . οἵοι Τροίαν μὲν ἐσπονδακότες λαβεῖν, Κρήτην δὲ παιζόντες.

722 τὸ ἄγαλμα τὸ ἐν Τλίψι νέον τὸν "Εκτορα καὶ μειρακιώδη φέρει. Probably φαίνει. *Sexcenties in φέρειν et φαίνειν scribae turbant et titubant*, says Cobet (D. Hal. p. 112).

726 δεθῆναι δ' αδ should probably be δεθῆναι δ' ἄν, though the mistake is oftener the other way, ἄν for αδ. But cf. for instance Thuc. 6. 91. 2, where M has δμως δ' αδ for δμως δ' ἄν.

In the remarks on epistolary style appended to the letters read at end of p. 364 ἡνα τούτῳ γοῦν ἡ βραχυλογία ὥραιζοιτο εἰς ἄλλην ἡχὴν πᾶσαν (for πᾶσα) στενὴ οὐσα.

H. RICHARDS.

AD MARCVM ANTONINV M.

M. Antoninus Imperator ad se ipsum recogn. I. H. LEOPOLD, Oxonii
(Scriptorum Classicorum bibliotheca Oxoniensis).

B, *ιε'.* "Οτι πάνι ὑπόληψις.

Fieri potest ut ita scripserit Marcus, suspiceris tamen πάνθ'. Cf. IB, *η*
(=IB, *κβ'*): "Οτι πάντα ὑπόληψις, IB, *κς'*: ὅτι πάνθ' ὑπόληψις.

B, *ιε'.* "Υβρίζει ἑαυτὴν ἡ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ψυχὴ μᾶλιστα μέν, ὅταν ἀπόστημα-
γένηται ἔπειτα δέ, ὅταν ἀνθρώπων τινα ἀποστραφῇ ἡ καὶ ἑαυτία φέρηται—. τρίτον
ὑβρίζει ἑαυτήν, ὅταν ἡσάσται ἡδονῆς ἡ πόνου τέταρτον, ὅταν ὑποκρίνηται καὶ
ἔπιτλάστως καὶ ἀναλήνως τι ποιῇ ἡ λέγη πέμπτον, ὅταν πράξιν τινα ἑαυτῆς καὶ
δρμῶν ἐπ' οὐδένα σκοπὸν ἀφῇ, ἀλλ' εἰκῇ καὶ ἀπαρακολούθητος ὅτιον ἐνεργῇ κτέ.

Vix dubium est quin scribendum sit γίνηται et ἀποστρέφη.

Z, *ιζ'*. Εὐδαιμονία ἐστὶ δαίμων ἀγαθὸς ἡ <ἡγεμονικὸν> ἀγαθόν.

Lacunam manifestam haud inepte suppleuit Gataker, malim tamen ut in
commentariis tam aliorum philosophorum quam Heracliti memoria plenissimis
δαίμων ἀγαθὸς ἡ <ἡθος> ἀγαθόν. Cf. Heracl. fragm. 119 (Diels *Vorsokratiker*
i² p. 78): ήθος ἀνθρώπῳ δαίμων.

I, *ιβ'*. Τις ὑπονοίας χρεία παρὸν σκοπεῖν τι δεῖ πραχθῆναι, καν μὲν συνορᾶς,
εὐμενῶς, ἀμεταστρεπτὴ ταύτη χωρεῖν ἐαν δὲ μὴ συνορᾶς, ἐπέχειν καὶ συμβούλους τοῖς
ἀρίστους χρῆσθαι· ἐαν δὲ ἔτερά τινα πρὸς ταῦτα ἀντιβαίνη, προιέναι κατὰ τὰς
παρούσας ἀφορμὰς λελογισμένως, ἔχόμενον τοῦ φαινομένου δίκαιον; ἀριστον γύρ
κατατυχάνειν τούτου, ἐπει τοι ἡ γε ἀπόπτωσις ἀπὸ τούτου ἐστίν.

Verba ἀριστον—τούτου recte interpretatus esse uidetur Gataker 'hoc enim
assequi, ut iuste agas, optimum est', quae sequuntur ἐπει τοι ἡ γε ἀπόπτωσις ἀπὸ¹
τούτου ἐστίν (sic Boot pro ἐστω, cf. B, *γ'*: δόγματα ἐστω Richards pro ἐστιν)
sensu cassa sunt, qui tamen restitui mihi uidetur si legimus ἀπροπτωσία i.e.
absentia temeritatis in adnuendo (ἐν συγκαταθέσει) et consequenter in agendo,
quae uirtus ab iustitia est (ἀπὸ τούτου), cf. IA, *ι'*: ἀπὸ δὲ ταύτης (τῆς δίκαιουσόντης)
αἱ λοιπαὶ ἀρεταὶ ὑφίστανται οὐ γύρ τηρηθῆσται τὸ δίκαιον, ἐαν ἡτοι διαφερόμεθα
πρὸς τὰ μέσα ἡ εὐεξαπάτησος καὶ προπτωτικοὶ καὶ μεταπτωτικοὶ διμεν, neque
aliunde paratur sed posita est in τῷ φύσει καὶ τῇ τοῦ λογικοῦ ἔφου κατασκενή,
αὐτῇ δὲ ἐπαγγέλλεται ἀπροπτωσίαν (Γ, *θ'*), cf. Z, *νε'*: ἐν τῷ λογικῷ κατασκευῇ τὸ
ἀπρόπτωτον. Itaque si habes in te ipso quo omnem scrupulum ex animo
euellas, τις ὑπονοίας χρεία; ubi ὑπονοία bene uertit Jackson 'timidity and
suspicion'.

A. I. KRONENBERG.

Rotterdam.

IN
edition I
to that
preceding

791
eis ψυχῆς

802
I think,

814
πάσῃ τῇ
παιδίας τοῦ

The
in the
children
good for
attracted

815
and I
of gram
ταῖται
which a
understa
we shou
supplied

942
βλέπο

960
πρώτη
ληχθέ
ἀμετάστ
the acc

NOTES ON PLATO LAWS I.-VI.

IN reading the last six books of Plato's Laws in Prof. Burnet's excellent edition I notice some passages the corruptions in which seem to me to be due to that very common fault of copyists, false change of case usually due to the preceding word or words.

791c ἐν δὴ καὶ τοῦτο *eis ψυχῆς μόριον ἀρετῆς* should be ἐν δὴ καὶ τοῦτο *eis ψυχῆς μόριον ἀρετῆν* (cf. 807c, where Ast's ἀρετῆν is certainly a right correction).

802d τό γε τῆς ἡδονῆς ἡ ἀηδίας περὶ ἑκατέρας οὐδὲν πεπλεονέκτηκεν should, I think, be τό γε τῆς ἡδονῆς ἡ ἀηδίας περὶ ἑκατέρας οὐδὲν πεπλ.

814a I should correct this *εἰ μηδενὸς ἔνεκα, ἀλλ' εἴ ποτε δεήσει πανόμει πάσῃ τῇ δυνάμει καταλείποντας τὴν πόλιν ἔξω στρατεύεσθαι τοὺς φυλάξαντας παιδάς τε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην πόλιν, ἵκανάς είναι τό γε τοσούτον.*

The women are to be trained in arms if for no other reason for this, that in the event of the whole male population, who while in the city guarded their children and all else, being compelled to take the field, the women may be good for so much at least, i.e. for garrisoning the city. *ἵκανάς* has been falsely attracted into the case of *τοὺς φυλάξαντας*.

815a The whole sentence as far as *μιμεῖσθαι* refers to the pyrrhic dance, and I think we should restore *ἐπιχειροῦσαν μιμεῖσθαι*. A false semblance of grammar has been produced by changing *ἐπιχειροῦσαν* to the case of *τὰς τάττας, ἐντριας*. What is *ταύτας*? It is *ταῖς εὐλαβείαις*. What are the things which are *ai ἐνάντιαι* to the *εὐλάβειαι*?—certainly not *όρχησεις*, as we must understand if we retain *ἐπιχειροῦσας*, and of course not *εὐλάβειαι*, as in strictness we should understand if we write *ἐπιχειροῦσαν*. I think the word to be mentally supplied from what precedes is *κινήσεις*.

942d καὶ δὴ καὶ χορείας τάσσας *eis τὰς ἀριστείας τὰς κατὰ πόλεμον βλέποντας χορεύειν.* *βλέποντας* was wrongly attracted to the case of *χορείας*.

960c 7 sq. I suggest as a restoration of this passage *τὸ Δάχεσιν μὲν τὴν πρότην εἶναι, Κλωθό δὲ τὴν δευτέραν, τὴν Ἀτροπον δὴ τρίτην σύτειραν τῶν ληχθέντων* (with Bekker) *ἀπρασμένα πη τῶν κλωσθέντων τῷ πήνει τὴν ἀμετάστροφον ἀπεργαζομένην δύναμιν.* The change of *ἀπεργαζομένων* to the acc. sing. seems quite necessary, as it is Atropos who makes her sisters'

work ἀμετάστροφον. The word was falsely attracted to the case of *τῶν λεχθέντων*. Atropos makes the *ληχθέντα* similar in a way to the reel or spool on which the spun thread is wound as regards their virtue of irreversibility. The *πήνος* is irreversible in this sense that to get the thread off it you can only turn it in one direction.

967 d 1 *τοὺς φιλοσοφοῦντας κυσὶ ματαίαις ἀπεικάσοντας χρωμέναισιν* ἥλακαις. Surely philosophers were never compared to dogs of this sex, and we should restore the masculine gender changed by a copyist who understood *ματαίαις* to go with *κυσὶ*.

In all these instances there is an obvious motive which may have prompted a copyist to change the case of a word, and the justification of the corrections I propose lies in this. Owing to the great grammatical freedom of the style I would never propose to change a case where no such motive can be discerned.

I add a few suggestions about other passages.

802 d 1 ἀκούων ἀεὶ τῆς ἐναντίας?

828 c 7 καὶ τὶ τῶν τούτοις?

836 a 4/5 ἡ τῶν ἀρχότων ὄψις διηναγκασμένη μὴ ἀποβλέπειν ἄλλοσε, τηρεῖν δὲ τοὺς νέους πάντας. The MS. text *τοὺς νέους τ' αὐτούς* is certainly corrupt. The change I suggest is not very violent. *πάντας* would mean 'at any cost.'

841 b 2 sq. τὸ δὴ λανθάνειν τούτων δρῶντά τι καλὸν παρ' αὐτοῖς ἔστω . . . , τὸ δὲ μὴ λανθάνειν αἰσχρὸν, ἀλλ' οὐ τὸ μὴ πάντας δρᾶν.

'It is to be regarded as good to do such things without being found out, but to be found out is to be regarded as a disgrace,' but then I cannot understand ἀλλ' οὐ τὸ μὴ πάντας δρᾶν, which can only mean, 'but not to do it at all is not to be regarded as a disgrace.' There has been no suggestion at all that continence could be regarded as disgraceful. Should we substitute *φανερῶς* for *πάντας*?

848 a 5 The reading of A ὅσαι χρεῖαι seems to me better. *τινί* refers to the producer and vendor.

849 b 8 We should write *τρίτη δὲ εἰκάσι τῶν ἔων ἔστω πρᾶσις*.

855 a 8 ἀνὴρ τι τῷ τοῦ κλήρου κατεσκευασμένου περιστενοῦ. 'If anyone has anything over after his property has been cultivated.'

887 d 7 It will be found that this very long clause reads much better if we insert *τε* after *σπουδῆ*. It may easily have fallen out before *τῷ*. The same remedy may be applied 921 e 1, inserting *τε* before *τιμάσ*.

934 a
870 c 8
oi
from fear
have used

935 d
when it is
chaff of the

936 c
man's slay
means the

947 d
This
from some
πίνοντες
ναϊσκόντες
bad conje
these pas
παρίνον.
well-known
Burnet o
known to

954 c
964 a
fairly dis
wrote
taken to
rate is qu

NOTES ON PLATO LAWS I.-VI.

113

934a 4 AO have *ἐν φόβοις δεινῶς*. We should restore *δειλοῖς*. Cf. 870c 8 *οἱ δειλοὶ καὶ ἀδίκοι φόβοι*. He distinguishes fear which is cowardly from fear which is not. I don't think *ἐν φόβοις δειλίας* is a phrase he would have used, and it is ill supported.

935 d 2 For *λοιδοροῦμεν* read *λοιδόρον μὲν*. 'And this (ridicule) is *λοιδόρον*, when it is uttered in anger.' He then goes on with *τι; δὲ ὁδὴ;* to discuss the chaff of the comic poets which is not angry and not *λοιδόρον*.

936c 8 Plato is obviously speaking of one man's slave injuring another man's slave; so we must write $\tauὸν ἀλλότριον$ for $\tauῶν ἀλλοτρίων$. καὶ ἐτιοῦν means then, of course, 'in any way at all.'

947 d 7 λίθων ποτίμων.

This reading is of high antiquity. Photius and Suidas, quoting doubtless from some lexicon to Plato, try to explain it thus: *μήποτε τῶν πάρων λέγει οἱ πίνοντες τὸ ὕδωρ ισχυρότροπο γίνονται, ἢ τῶν τὴν σάρκα τῶν ἐντιθεμένων καταναλισκόντων σωμάτων*, while Pollux (ix. 49) and Suidas (s.v. *ψαλίδα*) have the bad conjecture *πολυτίμων*, based of course on *ποτίμων*. Before I was aware of these passages in the lexicographers, I had conjectured that Plato wrote *λιθων πωρίνων*. Prof. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff considers it unlikely that such a well-known word as *πωρίνων* should have been corrupted to *ποτίμων*. Prof. Burnet on the contrary is inclined to agree with me. There is no instance known to me of *πότιμος* or *βρότιμος* bearing an active sense, *bibax* or *edax*.

954 c 3 L has $\chi\rho\circ\nu\circ\delta\epsilon$, and perhaps we should read $\chi\rho\circ\nu\circ\ddot{\delta}\epsilon$.

964a 8 ἡ τόν γε ὅτα τι. As my other suggestions have been, I trust, fairly discreet, I venture to offer a most audacious one to close with. Plato wrote ἡ τόν γ' ἐπαίσχυτα τι. This became ἡ τόν γε, παῖ, ὅτα τι, and παῖ, taken to be the vocative of παῖς, was expelled as a horror. ἐπαίσχυτα at any rate is quite the proper word here.

W. R. PATON.

ON AN INSCRIPTION TO MARS FOUND AT CAERWENT IN 1904.

THE inscribed stone, of which an illustration is here given, was found in a wall composed of large blocks, which had all formed part of some other construction. This wall, which had certainly formed no part of the original building, separated the eastern portion of House XI into two rooms numbered 5 and 6 in our plan. The text of the inscription as given by Dr. Ashby in the report published in *Archaeologia*¹ is as follows:

deo MARTI·LENO
SIVE OCEL^o·VELLAVN·^E·NIMA/G
M·NONIVS·ROMANVS·OB
IMMVNITAT·COLLIGN
D D S D
GLABRIONE·ET H^o·MVLO·CoS·X·KSEPT

[Deo] Marti Leni [si]ve Ocelo Vellaun(o?) et num(ini) Aug(usti) Marcus Nonius Romanus ob immunitat(em) collign(i) d(onum) d(e) s(uo) d(edit) Glabrone et Homulo co(n) s(ulibus) (ante diem) x k(alendas) Sept(embris) [23 August, A.D. 152].

On the interpretation of this inscription, Dr. Ashby wrote (for his references, see *Archaeologia*):

'Lenus is a not uncommon name of Mars in Rhenish inscriptions, while Ocelus has been only found once, on an inscription from Carlisle. It is possible that the dedicatory came from the Rhine, and that Ocelus is the British equivalent for Lenus. Vellaun(o) is a new epithet, but the meaning cannot be doubtful, the root being that of *duellum*, two or zwei, and recurring in the name of the Catuvelauni. The words *ob immunitatem collign.* give us more difficulty. The *immunitas* referred to is probably admission without payment of the monthly contribution or of the entrance fee usually exacted from members of a *collegium*; while *collign(ium)* must, probably, be recognised as a by-form of *collegium*: cf. *C.I.L.* vii. 1069, 1070, where the interpretation *col(umn)nam lign(eam)* is difficult to accept, and is indeed rejected by Hirschfeld in commenting on *C.I.L.* xii. 22, where *collign(ium)* again occurs. If not, we must interpret *col(legi) lign(ariorum)*, though there is no trace of a stop between the two 'l's. The reference would then be to a guild of timber merchants. An interesting point is this, that beside the feet of Mars are those of a water bird. This may be either a goose or a swan.'

¹See Vol. 59, p. 293.

AT

as found in
other con-
the original
is numbered
A. Ashby in

5) M(arcus)
Glabrione et
t, A.D. 152].

or his refer-

while Ocelus
able that the
t for Lenus.
t being that
The words
is probably
fee usually
e recognised
(*columnam*)
menting on
ret *col(legi)*
the reference
that beside
a swan.'



BASE OF A STATUE OF MARS FOUND AT CAERWENT IN 1904.

ON

The
here be
interest t
not be ou

(i) In
it is possi

In
dedication
there are
or *Marti*
conubio 1
to Mars

At C
Marcus A

Addi
appears t
cance to
already a
legion, as
refer to t

(ii) I
riorum)
inscriptio
two⁸ ele
support t

The
at Vence

(iii)

thèse two

It m
maintains
but the e
refers, is

The

Deo

Num

Here Hu
and *collig*

¹ C.I.L. v

² Waltzing

mainz, l. 19

³ C.I.L. x

ON AN INSCRIPTION TO MARS FOUND AT CAERWENT 115

The identity of the waterbird is discussed in a footnote which need not here be reproduced, but there are other points in this inscription of such interest that a somewhat fuller discussion than was possible in our report may not be out of place.

(i) In the first place if we accept the reading *collign(i)* as a by-form of *collegii*, it is possible that the *collegium* was that of the veterans of the Second Legion.

In Waltzing's list of colleges of veterans there are no instances of dedications to Mars, the only dedications to gods being to Jupiter, of which there are four;¹ but colleges of veterans sometimes bore the name of *Martenses*, or *Martiales*, or *Martis Cultores*.² In an inscription at Ravenna we have the *conubio veteranorum sive Martensium*,³ and we have at Augsbourg a dedication to Mars and Victory by the *contuberni ium Marti(s) Cu litorum*.⁴

At Caerleon, the station of the Second Legion, we have an inscription⁵ to Marcus Aurelius by the *vete[rani] et ho[norati] leg(ionis) II. A[ug(ustae)]*.

Additional weight is given to this suggestion by the fact that this legion appears to have been recruited from the Rhine (this would give fresh significance to the identification of Mars and Lenus), and by the fact that we have already at Caerwent a fragment⁶ of stone which possibly bears the name of the legion, as well as of a tile⁷ on which the letters **AVG** seem undoubtedly to refer to this legion.

(ii) Dr. Ashby's suggestion that *collign* might represent *col(legi) lign(a-riorum)* appears to be highly improbable in view of the fact that the only inscriptions quoted by Waltzing in which this gild is mentioned appear to be two⁸ election inscriptions at Pompeii, in which the *lignarii* recommend or support their candidates.

The interpretation of *collign(ium) iuuenum | Nemesiorum* in the inscription at Vence⁹ as *collegium lignariorum* is not, I believe, accepted by any one.

(iii) But thirdly, it may perhaps be permitted to suggest that neither of these two interpretations is the right one.

It may be admitted that the inscription just quoted proves, as Hirschfeld maintains, the existence of this by-form *collignium* for *collegium* on the continent, but the evidence afforded by the two inscriptions at Birrens, to which Hirschfeld refers, is by no means so certain.

The text of these two inscriptions is as follows:

Deo Mercurio | riuo Iul. Cres | cens sigill | collign cult | ores eius d s d | u s l m.¹⁰

Num Aug | deo Merc | sign posu | erunt cultores colligni eius | dem dei. | cur | Ing Rufo | u s l m.¹¹

Here Huebner follows Mommsen in interpreting *collign* as *col(umnam) lign(sam)* and *colligni* as *col(umnæ) ligni(as)*.

¹ *C.I.L.* v. 784, 2475; viii. 2618, 2626.

⁶ *Arch.* 57, p. 310.

² Waltzing, *Corporations Professionnelles chez les Ro- | mains*, i. 199.

⁷ *Ib.* 60, p. 124.

³ *C.I.L.* xi. 136. ⁴ *Ib.* iii. 5790. ⁵ *Ib.* vii. 105.

⁸ *C.I.L.* iv. 951 and 960.

⁹ *Ib.* xii. 22. ¹⁰ *Ib.* vii. 1069.

¹¹ *Ib.* vii. 1070.

In the first inscription, as I learn from a squeeze kindly sent me by Dr. Macdonald, there is not, as is given in the Corpus, a space between the two l's of *collign.*

This would support Hirschfeld's view, but on the other hand the 'wooden column' presents no real difficulty, and fits in not inaptly with the word 'sigillum' and the rude country in which the inscription was found. Other instances of votive columns have been found at Makter in Africa, where the column bears a bas relief of Bacchus, and the inscription reads *Liber Aug(usto) sac(rum). | In columna corpo(ris) . . . Liberum fundente(m) vinu(m) . . . fecit*;¹ in Cisalpine Gaul (. . . columnasque mag(isterio) fi | li [sui et s]uo Meneruae d(onum) d(at);² in Rome (*tabula(m) marmorea(m) cum proscenio et columnis d(ono) d(edit)*).³ It is conceivable that the columns mentioned in the last may have a purely architectural significance, but in the *aram [cu]m (?) colu[mn]is et | cultu . . . dis | d. d.* also found at Rome,⁴ the columns would seem to be votive in character. These columns enumerated above would be of marble or stone—but the substitution of wood for stone in Britain creates no difficulty.

In view then of the uncertainty of assuming that our inscription reproduces this by-form *collignum*, may it not be permitted to suggest that the letters stand for *colleg(ium) N(autarum)*? The letter before the G is almost certainly E, as the middle bar is visible even in the photograph, and the close resemblance of the letter to the E of *SEPT* is obvious, but the reading of I will not of course affect this suggestion.

Against this suggestion it may be urged firstly that there is no stop or space between the two l's, while they are used otherwise throughout the inscription, and not somewhat casually as (e.g.) in xii. 1069 quoted above. But it will be observed that the mason has misjudged the space necessary for this line and the fact that he has left a space before the beginning of it has not allowed him to complete it symmetrically without leaving over an odd word or odd letters. Indeed he has only just been able to squeeze in the last letters at all, as is shown by the fact that the letter N is nearer to the moulding than the last letter of any other line.

The omission of the stop or of a space may therefore be considered as not of great importance and the interpretation may be discussed on its own merits. It is true of course that we have not as yet any mention of such a gild in Britain, our list of known gilds in this country including besides those of a religious character and that of the veterans' at Caerleon, only two trade gilds—that of the *fabri* at Chichester and the *fabricenses* at Bath (the latter of course being connected with a legion). But this objection will have no weight if the inherent probability of the interpretation can be established. In favour of it, it may be urged that numerous corporations of boatmen existed on all the chief waterways of the empire.

¹ Waltzing, vol. iii. No. 1396.

² C.I.L. v. 703.

³ Jb. vi. 406.

⁴ Waltzing, vol. iii. No. 1318.

ON A

We h
Loire, the
the Moselle
Maros in
Guadalupe
and 161-1
of the Tib
complete
various na
going ship
distinction
stand for
V(eronensi
porations
also for th
made bel
Caerwent
this city.
Itinerary,
Bath to
followed b
Severn wa
Caerwent,
river. Wi
the fact t
Severn.
ferry and
their head

There
Caldicot I
ance, and
between t
case, have

The
this view,
dedication
those of v
negociantes
are uncer

There
negociantes

¹ C.I.L. ii.

² Jb. v. 401

³ Proc. of C

ON AN INSCRIPTION TO MARS FOUND AT CAERWENT 117

We have them in Gaul, on the Seine in the time of Tiberius, and on the Loire, the Rhone and the Arar. We have them on the Rhine, the Neckar, and the Moselle; in Switzerland on the Aar, the Durance, and the Isère; on the Maros in Dacia; on the Save and the lower Danube; in Spain at Seville on the Guadalquivir, where three different inscriptions are dated respectively A.D. 146, 145, and 161-169;¹ on the Italian lakes as well as on the Adriatic and the mouth of the Tiber. Space will not permit of references to all these corporations, but complete lists are given in Waltzing, vol. iv. These boatmen were known by various names, *nautae*, *lyntrarii*, *scapharii*, etc., while those who manned sea-going ships appear to have been more often styled *naucularii*, though the distinction is not always maintained. The **N** in our inscription would therefore stand for *Nautarum*, as in the inscriptions at Verona (*coll(egio) N(autarum) | V(eronensis) A(rilicae) consist(entium)*);² at Nîmes and elsewhere. These corporations were of great importance, not only for the supply of the capital, but also for the public service of the provinces. Reference to this will be again made below, but here it is necessary to state clearly that the position of Caerwent amply justifies and explains the existence of such a corporation in this city. It is the second station on the xivth Iter of the so-called Antonine Itinerary, the road, which starting from *Isca Legionum* (Caerleon) led through Bath to Calleva. The third station is Abona. I have discussed the line followed by this route elsewhere,³ and tried to show that the crossing of the Severn was worked from the mouth of Caldicot Pill, some two miles below Caerwent, to the mouth of the Avon, i.e. to the junction of the Trim with this river. Whether this view, which has met with some acceptance, be right or not, the fact remains that Caerwent is the last station on the Welsh side of the Severn. It is therefore obviously the place which must have controlled the ferry and precisely the spot where a corporation of boatmen would have had their headquarters.

There is also a considerable amount of evidence⁴ to show that either Caldicot Pill or St. Pierre Pill was in ancient times a harbour of some importance, and it seems reasonable to infer that there was communication and traffic between this harbour and Glevum higher up the Severn. There would, in this case, have been ample work for a corporation of boatmen.

The dedication to Mars may present some difficulty in the acceptance of this view, but as a matter of fact there are in Waltzing's lists only ten dedications⁵ to this god. Of these two are by gilds of soldiers, three are by those of veterans, two are by members of trades gilds, the *dendrophori*, and the *negotiantes*, one is by a gild of slaves and freedmen, and in two the dedicators are uncertain.

There was a close contact between the corporations of *negotiantes* or *negotiantes* and those of the sailors, and though they formed quite distinct

¹ *C.I.L.* ii. 1168, 1169, 1180.

² *ib. v. 4017.*

³ *Proc. of Clifton Antq. Club*, vol. i. p. 58.

⁴ See 'The Ancient Harbours of Gwent Iscoed,' by J. G. Wood, *Trans. Woolhope Naturalists' Field Club*, 1904, p. 191.

bodies they were constantly associated with each other, especially as regards the immunities which they enjoyed. At Delos we find *τὸ κοινὸν Ἐποτίαν Ποσειδονιαστῶν τῶν | ἑπτόρων καὶ ναυκλήρων καὶ ἔγδοκέων* (warehousemen) erecting a statue of the goddess Rome:¹ and the *ἑπτοροι* and *ναυκλῆροι* (*negotiantes* and *naucularii*) are again associated with each other in the letter written by certain Tyrians at Puteoli to the Senate at Tyre with regard to the maintenance of a *statio*.²

The dedication of the *negotiantes* referred to above is to Jupiter, Juno and Neptune as well as to Mars, so that even assuming a close connection between the guilds, it throws no great light on the question.

It would be interesting to know to what deities the corporations of boatmen and sailors were in the habit of making their dedications, but a somewhat careful search has only resulted in the discovery of the following: at Marbach *Gent(i)o nau(arum);*³ at Mantua to Hercules;⁴ at Ettlingen to Neptune;⁵ at Delos to *Roma*⁶ (see *supra*); at Lyons we have a base and no indication of the statue;⁷ and at Paris to Jupiter.⁷ The dedications at Ettlingen and Paris are of some interest, because in the former case the statue of Neptune is accompanied by a marine monster as well as by a dolphin, and it might be interesting to compare this with our waterbird, and in the latter case the Latin inscription (*Tib(erio) Caesare | Aug(usto) Joui optumo | Maxsumo (aram) | nautae Parisiac[i] | publice posierun[t]*) is accompanied by Celtic words, and there are also representations of what are presumably Celtic gods as well as what appears to be an identification of these with Roman gods. The four altars on which these are found are well illustrated in Desjardins, *Geog. de la Gaule Romaine*, vol. iii. pp. 261 sqq., and are discussed at length by Hirschfeld in the *Corpus*, and by Mowat, *Bull. Epigr. de la Gaule*, vol. i. (1881), pp. 49 sqq. Mowat's illustrations are less good.

The evidence afforded by this most interesting monument is not of course of great weight. Identifications of local and Roman gods were no doubt often made by soldiers as well as by sailors, but in any case it is an interesting parallel to our inscription and its identification of Lenus, Ocelus, and Mars.

On the whole then it may be said that the evidence afforded by the dedication tends somewhat to support Dr. Ashby's interpretation and my own first suggestion that if we read *colligni* the corporation is one of veterans, but it cannot be said that it precludes the other suggestion that we have here a *collegium nautarum*.

(iv) Dr. Ashby's interpretation of *immunitas* is of course possible. *Immunes* on several occasions showed their gratitude for their immunity by gifts to their college. For instance Cinnamus, a slave of the imperial house, makes a gift *collegio Liberi Patris et Mercuri | negotiantium cellarum uniariarum . . . ob immunitat(em) in the year A.D. 102*,⁸ and a statue of Venus is given to the *dendrophori [o]b onorim* (sic) *immunitatatis* (sic).⁹ An *immunis* gives a statue of

¹ Waltzing, iii. No. 183. ² *Ib.* iii. No. 1698.

³ *C.I.L.* xiii. 6450.

⁴ *C.I.L.* xiii. 6324.

⁵ *Ib.* xiii. 2002.

⁴ Waltzing, iii. No. 479.

⁷ *Ib.* xiii. 3026.

⁸ *Ib.* vi. 8826.

⁹ *Ib.* xiv. 107.

ON

Caracalla;

reason;

honoris e

various

combina

has fail

those co

various

Diuus

annonae

ciuilibus,

though

cases it

claimed

Waltzing

municipa

By

whose m

enjoyed

of immu

seems to

Waltzing

we have

Aper by

nostris si

not be c

If,

Brescia,

for at t

such ex

It w

belonged

Consul

inscripti

inscripti

is borne

as well

(v)

found w

would h

nothing

meeting

1 *C.I.L.*2 *Vol.*

ON AN INSCRIPTION TO MARS FOUND AT CAERWENT 119

as regards
 νὸν Βηρυτίων
 men) erecting
 (negotiantes
 r written by
 maintenance
 er, Juno and
 tion between
 of boatmen
 a somewhat
 at Marbach
 eptune;⁵ at
 ndication of
 n and Paris
 Neptune is
 it might be
 the Latin
 am) | nautae
 d there are
 what appears
 rs on which
 le Romaine,
 the Corpus,
 q. Mowat's
 of course
 doubt often
 interesting
 d Mars.
 ded by the
 and my own
 veterans, but
 have here
 . Immunes
 its to their
 takes a gift
 am . . . ob
 given to the
 a statue of
 i. 2002.
 *ib. xiv. 107.

Caracalla and a gift of money to the *cannophori*,¹ presumably for the same reason; and we find also gifts of a marble base (no doubt the base of a statue) *honoris causa*,² and there are other examples. These immunities were given for various reasons and are fully discussed and classified by Waltzing;³ but the combination of *immunitas collegii* may quite well have a sense which Dr. Ashby has failed to note. From the times of Claudius certain colleges, especially those connected with the supply of Rome, had been granted exemptions from various burdens, and by the second century these were regularized and common. *Divus Hadrianus rescripsit immunitatem nauium maritimorum habere qui annonae urbis seruiunt (Dig. 50, 6. 6 (5) § 5)*. This immunity was *a muneribus ciuilibus*, or *municipalibus* or *publicis*. It was not confined to gilds of sailors, though they seem to have been among the most highly privileged. In certain cases it included *tutelae uacatio*; but in the time of Trajan the *domini nauium* claimed but failed to obtain this exemption *inter privilegia*, which seems, as Waltzing says, to prove that from this time they were exempt from *munera municipalia*.⁴

By the time of Callistratus (end of the second century) all corporations whose members' trades contributed to the public advantage (*publicis utilitatibus*) enjoyed 'immunitas'.⁵ It may then be fairly urged that the natural meaning of *immunitas collegii* is an 'immunity which a gild enjoys.' The exact phrase seems to occur only once among the large number of inscriptions collected by Waltzing, and in this case it has precisely the meaning which I suggest. At Brescia we have an honorific inscription to *M. Nonius M. f. Fabia Arrius Paulinus Aper* by the *coll(egium) dendrophorum quod eius industria immuni[ta]s* | *as collegi nostri sit confirma[ta]*.⁶ The evidence which this inscription affords can certainly not be disregarded in discussing the meaning of our Caerwent inscription.

If, then, at Caerwent *immunitas collegii* has the same meaning as at Brescia, it would be additional evidence that we should read *colleg. n(autarum)*, for at the time our dedication was made it was to these gilds especially that such exemptions were made.

It would be interesting, but perhaps vain to suggest that our *M. Nonius* belonged to the same family as the *M. Nonius* at Brescia, who may have been Consul in A.D. 207, or in the reign of Alexander Severus. Mommsen on this inscription gives a list of other members of his family, whose names occur in inscriptions. All but one belong to the tribe *Fabia*. The cognomen *Romanus* is borne by none of them, but it was certainly borne by men of senatorial rank as well as by freedmen. (See Dessau, *Prosopographia imperii Romani*.)

(v) It seems reasonable to suggest that the place where this stone was found was actually the 'schola,' or, if it be a veterans' gild, the *curia* (the words would have the same meaning) of the *collegium*. We know indeed little or nothing of these meeting places. Religious and funeral gilds often had their meeting places in temples; but of the exact plan of those of professional or

¹C.I.L. xiv. 119.

²v. 2191.

³Vol. i. p. 490.

⁴Vol. ii. p. 402.

⁵Dig. 50, 6. 6 (5) § 12.

⁶C.I.L. v. 4341.

120 ON AN INSCRIPTION TO MARS FOUND AT CAERWENT

trade gilds we have little or no information. The word *schola*, Waltzing maintains, implies nothing definite as to shape, which might be rectangular, polygonal or circular.¹ But there seem to be two more or less permanent characteristics, viz. the bench where the members sat and the altar, for 'la schola était à la fois le local et le temple du collège.'²

Rooms 5 and 6 of House XI, where our inscribed stone was found, originally formed without doubt one room (see *supra*); and this room has in it a base of masonry about three feet square, symmetrically placed as regards the E. and W. walls and some four feet from the S. wall, the object of which we had regarded, as Dr. Ashby rightly says, as uncertain. But it seems now almost certain that this was the base of the altar; and the shallow recess in the south wall about five feet long—with relation to which the base is placed quite symmetrically—may well have been the niche in which the statue of Mars was placed. There are no certain traces of benches, but these may of course quite well have been of wood.

Further, Waltzing tells us that the *scholae* of trade gilds were often found in the quarter where the members worked. The situation of this building is near the south gate, which seems as far as we have yet discovered to have no relation to any road leading southward, but may well have been related to the stream which flows a little below the city, and which lower down forms Caldecot Pill. This stream is now only a brook; but two thousand years ago it was undoubtedly much wider and was probably tidal. It is too early to dogmatize on this point; further excavation can alone settle this question. But it may not be unwise to note here the possible relation between the situation of the *schola*, if it be one, and the south gate.

Lastly, one final suggestion may be hazarded. Is it possible that the gild, if it be one of sailors, was largely composed of veterans, who coming from the Rhine would naturally be apt for such a calling? This suggestion would account for the dedication to Mars and would give us a fairly harmonious and satisfactory explanation of all our difficulties.

It has, moreover, the support of an inscription at Carnuntum,³ . . . [m]agistri collegii veser]anoru(m) centonari | oru(m) im | pensis suis posuerunt. Waltzing, indeed, inclines to the view that this implies two distinct gilds,⁴ but both Mommsen and Hirschfeld hold that it indicates a gild of *centonarii* composed of veterans. The *centonarii* apparently discharged the duties of a public fire brigade, and it is not unnatural to suppose that veterans might have also undertaken the equally public service on the rivers.

A. TRICE MARTIN.

Note.—I have been unable satisfactorily to examine inscriptions referring to *collegia*, which have been found since the publication of Waltzing's book in 1900.

¹ Vol. i. p. 221.

² Id. ib. p. 223.

³ C.I.L. iii. 11097.

⁴ Waltzing, vol. ii. p. 206.

THE
Aristotle;
it fail, and
for instance
Pol. 1257
ἀλλά with
and it has
must be
question.

In the
represents
'than': the
expressed
neither of
the passage

In the
The exce
so Plato,
θέτην ἀξιο
ἀλλά 'Apia
that the
are comb
may tran
For insta

Cate
than, not

Top
ἢ τῷ σφο

N. I.

(other th

1 The pass
may be foun

2 So also (e
Küthner does
the first, no
sages of the

z, Waltzing
rectangular,
permanent
car, for 'la

was found,
n has in it
regards the
which we
seems now
v recess in
e is placed
ue of Mars
of course

often found
building is
to have no
ated to the
s Caldecot
go it was
dogmatize
ut it may
on of the

the gild,
from the
on would
nious and

[m]agistri
osuerunt).
ilds,⁴ but
arrii com-
a public
have also

ARTIN

ON THE USE OF *ἀλλ'* *ἢ* IN ARISTOTLE.

THE idiomatic use of $\delta\lambda'$ is found in classical writers is familiar in Aristotle; but there is a set of passages for which the ordinary renderings of it fail, and the difficulty is such that the text has been suspected. Bonitz, for instance, Index Aristotelicus, 33^b 20,¹ says of two of these passages, Pol. 1257^b 21, Metaph. 1038^a 14, that $\delta\lambda\lambda'$ is enough by itself, or even that $\delta\lambda\lambda'$ without η seems required (ubi ipsum $\delta\lambda\lambda'$ vel sufficit vel requiri videatur), and it has been proposed in the second of these places to read $\hat{\eta}$ for η . It must be contended that the text is sound in all the difficult passages in question.

In the Aristotelian usage three stages may be distinguished. The first represents the natural origin of the idiom, and here ἀλλ' ἵ may be rendered 'than': the second a modification of the first, where the meaning can be expressed by 'except': the third represents a further modification where neither of these translations can be given by itself, and to this class belong the passages which cause the difficulty.

In the first set of passages a general negation is followed by an exception. The exception might be introduced by *ἀλλά* alone, as indicating a contrast; so Plato, Laws, 710 C *εὐτύχης . . . μὴ κατ' ἄλλο, ἀλλὰ τὸ γενέσθαι . . . νομοθέτην ἀξιον ἐταίνου* (Ast's Lexicon), Dem. c. Mid. 554. 15, *μηδένα ἔτερον . . . ἀλλ' Ἀρισταρχον*. But the negative clause contains a word of comparison, so that the exception could be introduced by *ἢ* alone. The two constructions are combined² in *ἀλλ' ἢ*, and in consequence of the word of comparison we may translate 'than,' or 'but,' when 'but' can be the equivalent of 'than.' For instance :

Categ. 3^b. οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλλο σημαίνει τὸ λευκὸν ἄλλ' οὐ ποιόν (nothing else than, nothing but).

Τοπ. 103²⁰. τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς κρήνης ὑδωρ οὐδὲν ἄλλῳ διαφέρει ἀλλ' ἡ τῶν σφραγίδοθέαν είναι τὴν ὄμοιότητα.

³ N. Eth. 1124^b 31. ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἄλλον μὴ δύνασθαι ζῆν ἀλλ' η πρὸς φίλον (other than a friend). There are many passages of this type.³

¹ The passages from Aristotle quoted in this article may be found, with others, in the Index Aristotelicus.

⁹ So also (e.g.) Kühner, Gr. Gr. ii. 8 535, 6, Anm. 3. Kühner does not distinguish the second category from the first, nor does he recognise the existence of past-tense constructions in the first category. The constructions unlikely; but μᾶλλον η οὐ is a still more striking combination of adversative constructions.

³ For Platonic examples see Ast's Lexicon, vol. i. p. 202.

In the second stage the negative clause no longer contains a word of comparison, and in strict grammar the exception would not be introduced by *ἢ* alone. Nevertheless the notion of comparison may be so involved in a negative expression that it can be followed by *ἢ* alone, or by *ἀλλά* alone. Cf. Xen. Cyr. 2. 3. 10, *οὐδὲ παρ' ἐνὸς οὐδὲ τοῦτο μαθὼν . . . ἢ παρὰ τῆς φύσεως*; ib. 7. 5. 41 *μηδένα παρίναι ἢ τὸν φίλον* (Kühner, Gr. Gr. ii. § 542, An. 4), Eur. Hipp. 638 *οὐτις ἀλλ' ἐγώ* (Kühner, 535. 5). Thus the combination *ἀλλ' ἢ* is retained as in the first stage, but unless a word of comparison is supplied it cannot be translated 'than.' The meaning is expressed by 'except' or 'but,' when 'but' can be equivalent to 'except.'

Post An. 74^b 16. *ἔξι ἀναγκαῖοι δὲ οὐκ ἔστι (συλλογίσασθαι) ἀλλ' ἢ ἀποδεικνύντα; as if οὐκ ἀλλοις ἔστι ἀλλ' ἢ ἀποδεικνύντα.*

Metaph. 1005^a 12. *καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐ τοῦ γεωμέτρου θεωρῆσαι τὸ ἐναντίον ἢ τέλειον ἢ ὃν ἢ ἐν ἢ ταῦτὸν ἢ ἔτερον ἀλλ' ἢ ἔξι ὑποθέσεως.*

Politics, 1305^b 14. *διὰ τὸ ὀλίγους μετέχειν, καὶ, καθάπερ ἐρηται, εἰ πατήρ, νιὸν μὴ μετέχειν, μηδὲ εἰ πλείους ἀδελφοί, ἀλλ' ἢ τὸν πρεσβύτατον.*

Poetics, 1455^a 4. *ὅτι ὅμοιος τις ἐλήλυθεν, ὅμοιος δὲ οὐθεὶς ἀλλ' ἢ Ὁρέστης (no one except, no one but).*

There are also a considerable number of passages of this kind.

In the third stage the idiom has undergone a further and more important modification through another change in the form of the negative clause. Instead of a general negative statement, the negation is made only in certain instances which are intended as illustrations of it, but with the implication of the general negative to which exception is to be made. This implication causes the same construction as in the second class of passages, but owing to the ellipse the simple translation 'except' is no longer possible, and a clause must be introduced before it representing the general negative.

The form is, 'A is not B_1 nor B_2 nor B_3 , etc. [and, in general, no B] except B_4 ,' or 'A is not B_1 etc. [nor indeed any B] except B_4 ,' or 'A is not B_1 or B_2 , etc. indeed only B_4 .' Hist. An. 563^b 19 (Aristotle is contending that the cuckoo is not a form which the falcon takes at a certain season). *ἔστι δὲ μὲν ἥραξ γαμψώνχος, ὃ δὲ κόκκινος οὐ γαμψώνχος ἔστι δὲ οὐδὲ τὰ περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἔουσεν ἥρακι, ἀλλ' ἄμφω ταῦτα περιστέρα μᾶλλον ἀλλ' ἢ κατὰ τὸ χρώμα μόνον προσέοικεν ἥρακι.*

The denial is here made in the principal cases with the implication that it is generally valid. ' . . . Nor is the cuckoo like the falcon in the head either: (indeed there is no likeness) except that it is like the falcon in colour only.'

Ib. 580^a 20. *εἰ δὲ ἔστιν ὁ χρόνος οὗτος τῆς κυήσεως ἢ μή ἔστιν οὐδέν πω συνῶπται μεχρὶ γε τοῦ νῦν, ἀλλ' ἢ ὅτι λέγεται μόνον.*

The meaning is that there is nothing to go upon in the matter but hearsay; but the negation is expressed only for the principal source of evidence.

* We have not the evidence of searching observation: (nor indeed any evidence)

but hearsay
(nor anything)

Meta
ἢ ἀπόπου
λέγει καλῶ
ἀσχιστον,

Here
probably
divided in
"animal"
no other
"with un-

The
same cate-

Poli
χρηματων

Inst
ceeded, a
the gene-

'No
most (or
In the 1
and this
every wa

The
indices)

Philippu
ἢ συνεχή
ξένου μ
ἔσται].

ἔστω wa

produce
Πασιων

ταρὶ τ
ὅτι χρη
seem to
syllable

Ti
Kühner

* Newm
construction
354 B), w

is a word of
introduced by
involved in a
ἀλλά alone.
ἢ παρὰ τῷ
Gr. ii. § 542,
us the com-
f comparison
xpressed by

ἀλλ' ἢ ἀπο-

ὶ τὸ ἐναντίον
αι, εἰ πατήρ,
ἢ Ὁρέστης

are important
negative clause
only in certain
application of
implication
but owing
and a clause

eral, no B]
‘A is not
depending that
son). ἔστι
ἢ περὶ τὴν
τὸ χρῶμα

cation that
the head
falcon in

οὐδέν πω

matter but
evidence.
evidence)

but hearsay.’ Or ‘We do not know anything about it through investigation, (nor anything about it at all) except only that it is so reported.’

Metaph. 1038^a 10. πάλιν τοῦ ζῷου τὸν ὑπόποδος τὴν διαφορὰν δεῖ εἰδέναι γῆ ὑπόποντα. ὁστ' οὐ λεκτέον τοῦ ὑπόποδος τὸ μὲν πτερωτὸν τὸ δὲ ἄπτερον, εἴναι περ λέγει καλῶς, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ ἀδυνατεῖν ποιήσει τοῦτο, ἀλλ' ἢ τὸ μὲν σχιζόποντα τὸ δὲ ἄσχιστον, αὐτὰς γάρ διαφορὰν ποδός.

Here the negation is made for the principal case concerned, for Aristotle probably has in mind a current definition of ζῷον, in which ὑπόποντα was divided into πτερωτόν and ἄπτερον. ‘We cannot, properly speaking, divide “animal with feet” into “feathered” and “featherless,” as people do who see no other way, (and in general into nothing) except “with divided feet” and “with undivided feet.”’

The following passage is somewhat different in form, but belongs to the same category:¹

Politics, 1257^b 21. ἡ καπηλικὴ ποιητικὴ χρημάτων, οὐ πάντως, ἀλλ' ἢ διὰ χρημάτων μεταβολῆς.

Instead of a general negation we have a partial negation, οὐ πάντως, succeeded, as in the other examples of this class, by the construction proper to the general negation.

‘Not in every way’—οὐ πάντως—might have opposed to it ‘though in most (or many) ways,’ or ‘indeed in no way but one (or a few exceptions).’ In the latter case οὐ πάντως indicate the general denial by a kind of litotes, and this is what is in the writer’s mind in the present passage. ‘Not in every way, indeed only in the way of exchange.’

The only instance I have been able to find (by help of grammars and indices) of the third kind of passage in other writers is Demosthenes contra Philipum, 45. 13—δύναμιν τινα ὡς ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι φησὶ προχειρίσασθαι δεῖν ὑμᾶς, ἢ συνεχῶς πολεμήσει καὶ κακῶς ἐκείνον ποιήσει. μὴ μοι μυρίους μηδὲ δισμυρίους ζένους μηδὲ τὰς ἐπιστολιμάνους ταύτας δυνάμεις, ἀλλ' ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἔστω [v.l. ἔσται]. But the text is uncertain: perhaps a difficilior lectio ἀλλ' ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἔστω was altered to ἀλλ' ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἔσται.

Mr. Henderson, of New College, has pointed out to me that Blass has produced one by emendation in Demosthenes pro Phormione, § 43.—οὐδέν γάρ Πατιών ὁ σὸς πατήρ ἔκτησθε εὐρών οὐδὲ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ παραδόντος, ἀλλ' ἢ παρὰ τοῖς αὐτοῖς κυρίοις Ἀντισθένει καὶ Ἀχεστράτῳ τραπεζίτεύοντι πείραν δοὺς ὅτι χρηστός ἔστι καὶ δύκαιος, ἐπιστείθη. One MS. (A) has ἀλλη, the remainder seem to have ἀλλά (Sandys): in order to avoid the conjunction of three short syllables Blass conjectured ἀλλ' ἢ, quoting Thucyd. v. 60 in support of it.

The passage, however, from Thucydides is not a parallel. It might be if Kühner’s interpretation of it were right, but it is erroneous. The passage is

¹ Newman’s note on this passage, from the kind of construction to which he assimilates it (Plato, Protog. 354 B), would amount to putting it in the second category. It would belong to the second if we had οὐδέματα instead of οὐ πάντως.

ON THE USE OF ἀλλ' ἢ IN ARISTOTLE

as follows: καὶ οἱ μὲν ταῦτα εἰπόντες τῶν Ἀργείων ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν καὶ οὐ τοῦ πλήθους κελεύσαντος εἴπον καὶ ὁ Ἀγις δεξάμενος τοὺς λόγους αὐτὸς καὶ οὐ μετὰ τῶν πλεόνων οὐδὲ αὐτὸς βουλευσάμενος, ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν ἀνδρὶ κοινότας τῶν ἐν τέλει ξυστρατευομένων σπένδεται κ.τ.έ.

Kühner (ii. § 535, 6) renders 'sich nicht mit mehreren noch *mit sich allein* berathend,' and thinks the *ἢ* due to the comparative *πλεόνων*. But *τῶν πλεόνων* corresponds to *τοῦ πλήθους*, and the sense plainly is that just as the two Argives made their offer to Agis without consulting the general body (*πλῆθος*) of commanders on their side, so Agis did not consult the general body of commanders (*οἱ πλείους*) on his side either (*οὐδὲ αὐτός*), when he accepted the offer, except that he communicated with one of the commanders. This, therefore, is a quite clear instance of the second class of passages, and so of a common kind.

J. COOK WILSON.

τοῦ πλήθους
· μετὰ τὸν
λει ξυστρα-

t sich allein
But τὸν
just as the
neral body
the general
, when he
commanders.
ges, and so

WILSON.

PLATO, PHILEBUS, 31 C.

THE excellent article in the January number of the *Classical Quarterly* upon a mistaken interpretation of *Philebus* 31 C contains the somewhat incorrect statement that this interpretation is the general one: and the article itself is anticipated by a short note in a paper which I published in the *Transactions of the Oxford Philological Society* for 1881-2. I have nothing to complain of, for (as will appear) it may partly serve me right. Besides, my paper, though duly registered in the *Revue de Philologie*, is omitted from the index of that periodical; the aforesaid *Transactions* are out of print, and by some mischance my correction of the wrong rendering did not appear in the last edition of Jowett's *Plato*, though Jowett intended it should.

My note was as follows:

Jowett, Introduction to *Philebus*, page 3, second edition, 'Many points require further explanation; e.g. the reference of pleasures to the indefinite class (31 A) compared with the assertion which almost immediately follows, that pleasure and pain naturally have their seat in the third or mixed class: these two statements are unreconciled.'

After classifying pleasure under ἀπειρον—the other classes being πέρας, μικτόν, αἵρης ἐμμένεος—Plato next (31 A) inquires 'in what subject pleasure and knowledge reside and how they arise in that subject' (*ἐν τῷ τέτοιν ιδέαρον αἴροντι καὶ διὰ τοῦ πάθος γίγνεσθον*). The new question is not about the classification of pleasure. The answer to it is that pleasure is *ἐν τῷ κοινῷ γένει*: which means not that pleasure is to be classified in the *κοινῷ γένει* (i.e. in the *μικτῷ γένει*), but that the subject of which pleasure is an attribute is the *μικτὸν γένει*, that is a member of the class *μικτόν*. This subject is further on (32 A) explained to be *τὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἀπειρον καὶ πέρατος ἐμψυχον γεγονός θῶν*, the animal nature (*θῶν*). Pleasure then, according to Plato, belongs to the class *ἀπειρον*, and resides in subjects which belong to the class *μικτόν*. The only ambiguity is one of expression; in *ἐν τῷ κοινῷ γένει* the preposition does not refer to classification, and *κοινὸν γένει* is put loosely for certain members of the *κοινὸν* or *μικτὸν γένει*.

In justice to Stallbaum I should have added that, though possibly he did not express himself with sufficient clearness to be understood by some subsequent commentators, he certainly took the passage rightly: but owing to some preoccupation, which I do not seek to excuse, it did not even occur to me to look at Stallbaum at the time.

The writer of the article in the January *Classical Quarterly*, when representing the misinterpretation as 'general,' could not have been aware that it does not occur in some of the most important commentators, and that one of them specially warns against it in more than one edition. Stallbaum in his first edition points out the possibility of a mistake, and gives the right explanation in the *Prolegomena*, p. lxx: under the text there is a short note only.

In Stallbaum's last edition, 1842, the matter is referred to, as before, in the *Prolegomena* (p. 47), and a longer note, almost identical with the passage in the *Prolegomena* of the first edition, is given under the text. This is as follows:

Sedem voluptatis atque doloris in mixto genere quaerendam esse censem. Id quod fortasse alicui primo certe aspectu mirum videatur. Nam voluptas antea ad τὸ ἀπειρον̄ referebatur. Enimvero probe discernenda est quaestio antea instituta, de *genere* voluptatis in se spectatae, ab ea quae nunc suscipitur de *sede* et origine doloris ac voluptatis. Dicitur igitur nunc voluptas ac dolor in τῷ κοινῷ sive ξυμμισγούντῳ inesse, propterea, nisi fallor, quod omnia animalia ipsique homines, in quos voluptatis ac doloris sensus cadit, ad τὴν γεγενημένην οὐσίαν referri debent; quidquid vero aut infinitum tantum est aut finitum, id voluptatis aut doloris capax esse non potest; neque enim in eo harmoniae vel dissolutio vel restitutio locum habet, in qua una voluptatis et doloris caussam atque originem positam esse docetur.

Bekker's edition (1826) of the works of Plato, with explanatory notes derived from a number of commentators, repeats the short note under the text of Stallbaum's first edition.

In the German edition with translation and notes by Dr. F. W. Wagner (Leipzig, 1857), the translation is such as accords with a right understanding of the passage, and this is confirmed by the short analysis in the Introduction, p. xx.

Coming to the English commentators, the mistake is not found in Poste (edition with commentary 1860, translation 1860). There is no note in his commentary, and from this, considering his accuracy and conscientiousness, one may be sure, even if there were no other evidence, that he took the passage rightly. For if he had not he would have felt the obvious difficulty about the classification which the mistake involves, felt by all who have made the mistake, and he would certainly have mentioned it. Further, editing the *Philebus* after Stallbaum, he was certain to have studied him carefully—he quotes Stallbaum in a near context—and if he had disagreed with him on such a point would have said so. Doubtless he agreed with Stallbaum that there was no difficulty at all if the words were only read attentively (at vero nullas prorsus hic inveniemus difficultates modo verba diligenter et attente legerimus), and then it was in keeping with Poste's self-restraint to say nothing about it. Poste's translation quite confirms this, for he follows Stallbaum's use of 'sedes', the word by which Stallbaum marked the true nature of the question asked in 31 B (it is italicised in his first edition¹). Poste translates 31 B 'We must next inquire where each is seated'; and 31 C 'I think both pleasure and pain have their seat in the mixed class.' Again, in Poste's analysis of the argument the text is treated as assigning Pleasure to the class of the ἀπειρον̄ only.

The wrong rendering is found in Badham, Paley, and Bury. Paley may have got it from Jowett or Badham, for he studied both carefully; but he adds some singular mistakes of his own. Bury's note seems to combine those of Badham and Paley. The able writer of the article in the January number of the *Classical Quarterly* appears to have been thinking of Bury and Badham.

J. COOK WILSON.

¹ Cf. also *Prolegomena* of last edition, p. 47, 'Itaque facile apparet sapientissime philosophum voluptatis atque doloris sedem [not pleasure itself] ad tertium genus retulisse, neque hoc in re ipsum secum pugnare

dicendum esse.' It is true Jowett has 'seat' in his own translation, but one suspects he followed Poste's translation without seeing the special point of it.

DISSATI
(vv. 1-24),
of the poem
criticised, and
Classical Re
But the di
remain, and
I shall
treatment of
with adequa
Let us
which he is
This, as Mr.
date between
in progress.
latter half o
or even as e
iteratio, whi
summer sol
exiles agri (a
autumnal ec
come (L. 19
subjoined.

Fauonius (L
to the rising
summer sol
we are poin
part of Jun

But no

the winter
1 Horace, Od
this connexion.
vice uras et Fa

et. Id quod
d rō ātepor
genere voluptatis
ac voluptatis.
e, propterea,
oloris sensus
n tantum est
enim in eo
s et doloris

atory notes
er the text

igner (Leip-
ding of the
n, p. xx.

ed in Poste
note in his
usness, one

the passage
culty about
made the
editing the
refulay—he

m on such
that there
vero nullas
legerimus),

g about it
of 'sedes,'
n asked in

'We must
e and pain
the argument
y.

Paley may
ut he adds
e those of
ry number
d Badham.

WILSON.

'seat' in his
llowed Poste
oint of it.

ON SOME TIBULLIAN PROBLEMS.

I. THE FEAST OF LUSTRATION IN II. i.

DISSATISFIED with current views upon the exordium of Tibullus II. i. (vv. 1-24), I proposed in *Selections from Tibullus* (1903) to make the occasion of the poem the *Sementiua Feriae* instead of the *Ambarualia*. This proposal, criticised, amongst others, by Mr. Warde Fowler in an interesting article in the *Classical Review* (xxii. 1908, pp. 36 sqq.), I have now abandoned (*ib.* p. 40 *b*). But the difficulties which led me to break away from previous exegesis still remain, and to them I address myself in the present article.

I shall assume that these difficulties do not arise from lax or 'poetical' treatment of facts, and that here, as elsewhere, Tibullus writes upon rustic matters with adequate knowledge and care.

Let us collect the indications which he gives of the season of the festival which he is here describing. Firstly, a lamb is mentioned as the offering (15). This, as Mr. Fowler says (l.c. p. 37), is not decisive, but it is consistent with any date between the middle of January and, say, the end of June. Ploughing, again, is in progress. This may be the *proscissio* which in *uliginosi campi* took place in the latter half of April (Columella, ii. 4. 3), but in *colles pinguis soli* (*ib.* § 9) in March, or even as early as February in mild weather or dry districts. Or it may be the *iteratio*, which is to be accomplished after the middle of April and before the summer solstice (§§ 4, 9). The *tertatio*, which, like the *proscissio* and *iteratio* of *exiles agri* (§ 11), took place in the beginning of September (§ 4) or about the autumnal equinox (§ 9), it cannot be, since Tibullus refers to the harvest as yet to come (l. 19). To Columella's statements those of Varro, *R.R.* i. 28, may be subjoined. He mentions ploughing in the period between the first blowing of Fauonius (Feb. 7) and the vernal equinox, in that from the vernal equinox to the rising of the Pleiads (May 8), and again in that which ended with the summer solstice, the first two periods being the most important.¹ So far, then, we are pointed to a date between the earlier part of February and the latter part of June.

But now we come to the passage which seemed to me clearly to indicate the winter and therefore to be incompatible with any date that could be

¹Horace, *Odes*, I. iv., is especially interesting in this connexion. He refers to *Fauonius* in l. 1, 'grata
vice ueris et Fauoni.' A lamb is mentioned in 12, and

in 3 the cattle are no longer in sheds or the plough-
man by the fire ('neque iam stabulis gaudet pecus aut
arator igni').

assigned to an Ambarualian festival or *agrorum lustratio* (l. 1 'fruges lustramus et agros'). It follows on the prayer in lines 17-20.

di patrii, purgamus agros, purgamus agrestes :
uos mala de nostris pellite limitibus.
neu seges eludat messem fallacibus herbis
neu timeat celeres tardior agna lupos.
tunc nitidus plenis confusis rusticus agris
ingeret ardentis grandia ligna foco ;
turbaque uernarum, saturi bona signa coloni,
ludet et ex uirgis extruet ante casas.
euentura precor : uiden' ut felicibus extis
significet placidos nuntia fibra deos?

I had supposed the time contemplated in *tunc* to be immediate, and the connexion of thought to be 'Grant the farmer's prayer, and he may thereupon to-day, with full confidence in the future, indulge his genius in his cheerful home,' but I now believe (as I wrote to Mr. Fowler, l.c. p. 38 a) that its reference is prospective and to a period posterior to anything in the context.

Mr. Fowler accepts this interpretation of *tunc*, but holds an entirely different theory as to the purport of the passage. For his defence of it, which rests upon some undeniable though, I believe, accidental ambiguities, I must refer to his own article; but its presentation may be condensed as follows. 'The poem and the *lustratio* it describes belong to the spring.' 'The omens are favourable, the *lustratio* is successful, and the husbandman may look forward to the time when the crops are no longer in danger (*confusis plenis agris*, which he understands as feeling every confidence in the fields full of the now ripe or ripening corn), and when he will be able to take his part in the general rejoicings with a light heart.' These 'general rejoicings' he finds in 22-24. 22 *ardenti foco* he understands of 'a midsummer bonfire or of an altar-fire at a summer festival,' inclining apparently to the former (p. 39 a). And in the next couplet he sees 'a survival of an ancient bit of custom or ritual in which the *uernae* took part, making booths or tabernacles out of *uirgae*. To this he finds parallels in Ovid's account of the feast of Anna Perenna on the Ides of March (*Fasti*, 3. 523), in Tibullus's (ii. 5. 95 sqq.) of an unspecified festival and in Festus's mention of the *Neptunalia*, July 23, when booths or huts were erected, made of the foliage of trees: 'Vmbræ uocantur Neptunalibus casae frondeæ pro tabernaculis' (p. 377). Now the sense, upon which Mr. Fowler bases his theory of a 'ritual' allusion, can be extracted from the Latin of 24, and others have in fact so extracted it, and it may therefore here be submitted to an examination in detail which the enforced brevity of my notes in the *Selections* prevented it there from receiving.

The parallels cited by Mr. Fowler for the custom appear to fail him in an important respect. Why is it not the *coloni* but the *uernae* that make booths of branches here? In Ovid and in Tibullus (ii. 5. 95) this 'bit of ritual' is performed by *freemen*.

In 21 p.
Tac. *H.* 2. 1
of the sown
grauidæ quæ
Fowler think
through the
to encounter
the face of
adverb show
fidence. Fu
has sown is
agricolas : s
3. 61 'at the
terra fide.'

Need w
that the co
cold? If s
and Ovid, A
et *arsuris* g

In 23 a
Mr. Fowler
698 'quid'
65 sqq. 'o
vescor *uer*
ing a princ
urged on n
pp. 153-1
parallelism
sinu^{is} and
interpretati
bona signa
Juvenal 14
patrem ipse
quatuor, u

As for
game, as is

¹ I have pr
present point
like *agris* here

² For this, it
came later in
orum now mo
A transition
22. 44, where
person in the

NO. X. 1

In 21 *plenis—agris* might certainly mean 'full of the standing corn.' Cf. Tac. *H. 2. 12* 'pleni agri; apertae domus.' But it may just as well mean 'full of the sown seed.' Cf. Ovid, *Fasti*, 4. 633 sq. 'nunc grauidum pecus est; grauidae quoque semine terrae. | telluri plenaec uictima plena datur.' *confusis*, Mr. Fowler thinks, 'suits better with crops that have come to maturity and thus passed through the greater part of the perils that beset them than with seed that has yet to encounter so many natural dangers.' But his objection cannot be upheld in the face of Tibullus, i. 9. 45, 'tum miser interii, *stulte confusis amari*,'¹ where the adverb shows *confidere* is just as suitable of unwarranted as of justifiable confidence. Furthermore, the husbandman's trust in the good faith of the land he has sown is an idea that naturally occurs to our poet; ii. 6. 21 sq. 'spes alit agricolas: spes sulcis *credit* aratis | semina, quae magno faenore *reddat* ager,' 3. 61 'at tibi, dura seges, Nemesim quae abducis ab urbe, | *persoluat* nulla *semina* terra *fide*.'

Need we adduce proof that the simple and obvious sense of the next line is that the countryman heaps logs upon his blazing hearth to keep out the bitter cold? If so, Hor. *Carm. i. 9. 5* 'dissolute frigus, *ligna super foco | large reponens*' and Ovid, *Fasti*, 4. 509 sq. 'illa domum glandes exuissaque mora rubetis | portat et *arsuris* grandia *ligna focis*' will serve our turn.

In 23 *uernarum* in itself may signify either 'home-born slaves in general' (so Mr. Fowler) or 'home-born slave children,'² which is its meaning in Plautus, *Miles*, 698 'quid? *nutrici* non misseru's quicquam quae *uernas* alit?', Horace, S. ii. 6. 65 sqq. 'o noctes cenaeque deum quibus ipse meique | ante Larem proprium uestor *uernasque* procacis | *pasco libatis dapibus*'; cf. *Epop. 2. 65*. But, following a principle, the importance of which for the interpretation of Tibullus I have urged on more than one occasion (*Journal of Philology*, xxvi. pp. 87 sq., xxviii. pp. 153-156; *Selections from Tibullus*, p. 208), we shall be guided by the parallelisms of i. 5. 25 sq. 'consuescit amantis | garrulus in dominiae *ludere uerna* sinu'³ and ii. 2. 22 'ludat et ante tuos *turba* nouella pedes' to regard the second interpretation as more probable. The youthful *uernae* (the signs of prosperity, *bona signa*) are of course the offspring of the well-fed *colonus* and his *ancillae*. Juvenal 14. 166 sqq. seems a parallel worth quoting, 'saturabat glaebula talis | patrem ipsum *turbamque casae* qua feta iacebat | *uxor* et infantes *ludebant* quattuor, unus | *uernula*, tres *domini*'.⁴

As for the last sentence, building houses (*aedificare casas*) was a children's game, as is attested by Hor. S. ii. 3. 247 (and 275). And in Tibullus the adverb

¹ I have printed the MS. reading *amari*, as the present point is not thereby affected, but *Amori*, dat. like *agris* here, is extremely probable.

² For this, it would seem, the more exact diminutive came later into vogue; Sen. *Dial. ii. 6* 'cogita filiorum nos modestia delectari, *uernularum* licentia.' A transition in use seems indicated in Pliny, *N.H. 22. 44*, where *uerna*—*uernula* are used of the same person in the same context.

NO. X. VOL. III.

³ It is important to observe that here, the only other place where Tibullus uses *uerna*, it must refer to a child.

⁴ Mr. Fowler apparently takes *ludat* as generally indulging in 'jollification,' but in Tibullus, when applied to adults, it would more naturally have the erotic sense of i. 3. 64 and i. 87 of the present poem.

ante may refer indifferently to space or to time; see e.g. i. 10. 68 and 78 of our poem.

A reader then who is not in search of survivals of ancient ceremonials¹ may, I think, rest content to interpret this passage as a natural description of a winter scene in an Italian country home. The working year is over, the seed is sown; and the prosperous farmer, blessed with a good harvest and full of trust that the earth will continue to yield him her increase, piles up the cheerful household fire, round which play the little *ueruae*, the proofs of his prosperity.² And its connexion with what precedes will be by no means obscure. 'Let us celebrate this feast of purification for our crops and herds with all the due traditional rites, and let us in purity and sincerity pray to the country gods to bless us, so that our harvest may not disappoint our just expectations nor the wolf ravage our flocks. Then, when the crops are gathered and the autumn sowing done, we may take our ease at home, looking forward to another prosperous year.'

The exact date of the illustration described by Tibullus, which we may call a private *Ambarualia*, no antiquarian research has been able to determine; doubtless for the reason that it was not fixed but varied with the year, the district, and the convenience of the farmer. The latitude indicated above (p. 127) is countenanced by the language of Virgil, who, while assigning the festival to early spring, *Georg.* i. 339 sqq. 'sacra refer Cereri laetis operatus in herbis, | extremae sub casum hiemis iam uere sereno; | tum pinguis agni et tum mollissima uina, | tum somni dulces densaeque in montibus umbrae,' and 345 'terque *nouas* felix eat hostia fruges,' contemplates nevertheless the possibility of its being celebrated much later, inasmuch as he warns the husbandman that it must be over *before* the corn is cut, 347 sqq. 'neque ante | falcem maturis quisquam supponat aristis | quam Cereri torta redimitus tempora queru | det motus incompositos et carmina dicat.' Within this period of the year would fall the small number of datable rustic festivals in various parts of Italy which are mentioned by Wissowa, *Real-Encyclop.* i. p. 1796.

II. ON LYGDAMVS.

In my *Selections from Tibullus* I contended for the following propositions:

1. *Lygdamus* was the poetaster's real name, while *Neaera*, that of his lady-love, was in all likelihood an assumed one.³ Though the latter cannot be directly

¹ Tibullus 'is thinking of some local summer festival, otherwise unknown to us' (Mr. Fowler, l.c. p. 406. The italics are mine).

² For Tibullus's sympathy with children see, besides the two places just quoted, i. 10. 16 and ii. 5. 91 sqq.

³ Prof. Cartault's argument, *Tibulle* (1909), p. 73 'son nom peut être facile, mais, comme c'est un nom courant de courtisane, l'hypothèse est peu vraisemblable,' is unconvincing. If *Neaera* was for this

reason unsuitable to be adopted as a soubriquet, it was for the very same reason unsuitable to be retained, contrary to custom, as a real name. *Lygdamus*, we may feel sure, would not stray from the convention. [I take the opportunity of correcting an error in my review of Prof. Cartault's *A propos du Corpus Tibullianum, Classical Quarterly*, 1908, p. 225 n. At iv. i. (Pam.) 86 his intention was to read 'fontis ubi' (as I said it should be), but his printer made it *uti.*]

established
etiquette
Delia; P.
SULPICIA,
this I do n
not know

2. He
argument
inconclusi
rights of
Prof. Cart
The wealth
just as im
that even
plenty of
term whic
elsewhere,
note was
extremely

1242, 1
20222, 1

Prof.
Tibullus.
that he w
his imitat
that I ca
the death
B.C. 16, a
time betw

1. J. Köhn,
i. pp. 213 sq

established, there is no reason for assuming a deviation from Roman literary etiquette in such matters. CATULLUS, *Lesbia*; GALLUS, *Lycoreis*; TIBULLUS, *Delia*; PROPERTIUS, *Cynthia*; NASO, *Corinna*, etc., to which we may add SULPICIA, *Cerinthus* (*Selections*, p. xxxviii, note (3)). Why any one should dispute this I do not know, except on the ground, surely an insufficient one, that he does not know who Lygdamus was.

2. He was probably a *freedman*. For his name was that of a slave, and the argument for a Roman descent drawn from iii. 1. 2 'nostris—auis' is wholly inconclusive, as 'a new Roman citizen entered as a matter of course into all the rights of the native' (op. cit. p. xlvi). I am glad now to have the support of Prof. Cartault, *Tibulle* (1909), p. 74, who refers to Horace, *Carm.* iv. 15. 25 sqq. The wealth attributed to him on the score of the magniloquent phrases of iii. 3 is just as imaginary. 'Wishes,' I said, 'cost nothing,' and Prof. Cartault points out that even if he had wealth, a theory discredited by 3. 23 and 5. 31, so had plenty of other freedmen in his times. Further, I drew attention to the peculiar term which he applies to his relation to Neaera: *coniunx* 1. 26 (and note) and elsewhere, *coniugium* 4. 79. The researches of two scholars published since my note was written confirm my inference, showing, as they do, that *coniunx* is extremely frequent on the inscriptions of freedmen; *C.I.L.* i. 1053, 1220, 1240, 1242, 1479, 1064, 1413, 1011; vi. 15389; 16306, 21326, 24711, 18616, 20222, 17082.¹

Prof. Cartault (op. cit. p. 88) conjectures that Lygdamus was a freedman of Tibullus. This of course is possible. But if we are to guess, I prefer the guess that he was the Lygdamus of Cynthia and Propertius, *Selections*, p. xlvi n. 2 (where his imitations of Propertius are referred to). There is no chronological difficulty that I can see. Lygdamus is mentioned in Prop. iv. 7. 35, a poem written after the death of Cynthia. But no poem in that book appears to be later than B.C. 16, and on my theory Lygdamus may have published the Third Book any time between B.C. 15 and B.C. 3.

J. P. POSTGATE.

¹J. Köhn, *Altlateinische Forschungen*, p. 86 (on *coniunx*), and E. H. Sturtevant, *Classical Philology*, i. pp. 213 sqq.

TRAUBE'S *NOMINA SACRA* AND POSTHUMOUS WORKS.

Nomina Sacra: Versuch einer Geschichte der christlichen Kürzung. Von LUDWIG TRAUBE, o. ö. Professor der Philologie an der Universität, München. (*Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters.* Herausgegeben von LUDWIG TRAUBE. Zweiter Band). Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1907. Pp. x+295. M. 15.

Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen. Von LUDWIG TRAUBE. Herausgegeben von FRANZ BOLL. Erster Band. *Zur Paläographie und Handschriftenkunde.* Herausgegeben von PAUL LEHMANN. Mit biographischer Einleitung von FRANZ BOLL. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1909. Pp. lxxv+263.

THE term 'nomina sacra' Traube borrowed from Sir E. Thompson, who designated abbreviations ΘC for θεός, DS for *deus*, as 'sacred and liturgical contractions' or 'contractions of sacred names.' Roughly speaking, these abbreviations are (with Q. for *que* and B. for *-bus*) the only abbreviations found in Latin majuscule MSS., so that this book provides us with a part of that history of Latin abbreviation, which was to have formed one volume of Traube's great work on Latin Palaeography. Other parts would have dealt with the Notae Juris (used in early legal MSS.) and with the large field of minuscule abbreviation; and, no doubt, the symbols found on inscriptions would not have been left unnoticed.

Latin majuscule abbreviation engrosses the fourth section of this book. The third gives us full details of the Greek contractions of 'nomina sacra,' while the fifth and sixth pursue the same investigation in Coptic, Gothic, Armenian, and Slavonic MSS. All these details Traube makes subservient to the theory which dominates the book, the theory that abbreviation by contraction is of Hebrew origin. The Jewish practice of obscuring by a symbol (the Tetragram) the name of the Supreme Being, was imitated by Greek translators of the Jewish Scriptures in the symbols ΘC, ΚC, etc., and by Latin translators of these Greek versions in the symbols DS, XPS, DNS, etc. Since the production of manuscripts was in the hands of monks, this method of abbreviating sacred names was extended in course of time to other words also. The phrases 'deus meus,' 'deus noster,' at first written DS MEUS, DS NOSTER, came to be written DS MS, DS NR; and, little by little, the practice was extended in

Latin mediaeval MSS. over a large number of words, although in Greek, curiously enough, it remained almost wholly restricted to 'nomina sacra.'

Readers of the book will, I think, soon abandon their first attitude of startled incredulity, and will acknowledge with grateful admiration that Traube has demonstrated the truth of his theory, as fully as the scanty records of these early Greek and Latin versions of the Bible admit of demonstration. For the benefit of those who have not the opportunity of reading Traube's own words, I will give in outline the course of his arguments.

Abbreviations in MSS. are of two kinds, (1) by Suspension, when the initial letter (or letters) of the word (or the initial letter of each or some of the syllables) is unaccompanied by the final letter, e.g. **D.** 'deus,' 'dei,' 'deo,' etc., **DOM.** (or **DMN.**) 'dominus,' 'domini,' 'domino,' etc.; (2) by Contraction, when the final letter of the word is written along with the initial letter (or the initial letter of each or some of the syllables), e.g. **Dō** 'deo,' **DōNō** 'domino.' We must in future use the term 'contraction' (or 'abbreviation by contraction') of the second kind only, and use for the other kind the term 'suspension' (or 'abbreviation by suspension'). Suspension is the Pagan or pre-Christian form of abbreviation; contraction does not appear until the Christian period, and is characteristic of Christian writings. The abbreviations used in the literary Greek papyri are suspensions, e.g. **κ'** for **καὶ** (whence **κροὶ** for **καὶρῳ**), **πω̄** for **πόδας**, **πωλ'** for **πωλεμων**. So are the symbols of Latin Inscriptions, e.g. **C.** (or **CS.**) for 'consul' (-lis, -li, etc.), **IMP.** for 'imperator' (-ris, -ri, etc.). These symbols are accompanied by a dot, and are evidently designed to save space, since any word of common occurrence is symbolized in this way. When we come to Christian times, we find three changes. Christian abbreviation-symbols have a superscript stroke instead of a dot, e.g. **Dō** for 'deo': only a limited number of words (the 'nomina sacra') are symbolized: the final letter of the word invariably accompanies the initial. It was the second of these, the restriction of abbreviation to 'nomina sacra,' that led Traube to his discovery. He had remarked many years ago that **Dō**, etc., never appears in the earliest MSS. for 'deo' in a Pagan sense, but only for the Christian God; **SPU** never represents *spiritu* in the sense of 'breath,' but only in the sense of 'the Holy Spirit.' And he had argued (rightly, as is now acknowledged) that the Codex Romanus of Virgil, which has **Dō** at Aen. i. 303 (cf. Ecl. i. 6), cannot be earlier than the sixth century, the time when the restriction of the use of these symbols began to be relaxed. The (seventh century?) corrector of the Oxford Primasius (Douce 140) regards it as an error wherever he finds *deus* 'God' and *dominus* 'Lord' written in full, and substitutes the contractions. Similarly in an old Greek codex at Milan (A 147 inf.) the scribe himself expands the contraction-symbol which he had inadvertently used for **κύριος** in its non-Christian sense. Indeed it is not until the ninth century that these contractions are freely used in Greek profane writings, and, although the barriers were earlier over-stepped in Latin, there is no lack of indications that even Carolingian

scribes recognized that these contractions were properly Christian symbols. A Carolingian corrector will often substitute *dō* for *deo*, *spū* for *spiritu*, when these words are used in their religious senses, and on the other hand will expand the contractions when the words have no religious significance.¹ And, in fact, Traube's discovery is partly anticipated by the remark of a ninth century writer, Christian of Stavelot, who (in a discussion of the symbol for *Iesus*) mentions, as the reason for these contractions, 'quia nomen dei non potest litteris explicari. Quando purum hominem significat, per omnes litteras scribitur.' The contraction of 'nomina sacra' was not designed to lighten the labours of the scribe; it was a mark of honour paid to these holy names.

In Hebrew MSS. the names of God were sometimes written in gold, a practice especially prevalent at Alexandria. This was imitated in Greek and Latin MSS. When St. Jerome speaks of Bibles in purple, silver and gold, he means Bibles on purple vellum, with the holiest names in gold, and others in silver; he means, in fact, what we find in the St. Petersburg 'codex purpureus,' in which the contractions of words like *θεός* are written in gold, and of words like *οὐρανός* in silver. The use of the Tetragram in Hebrew MSS. was a similar mark of honour. It was an attempt at concealment of the most holy of all names. Not merely would the omission of the vowels prevent it from being understood by the vulgar, but the priest himself, in reading aloud, used to substitute for it another name. Besides, we hear of a practice of using in this symbol characters taken from an obsolete form of the alphabet. When the sacred books of the Jews were translated into Greek, Aquila (as we see in the newly-found Cambridge fragments) reproduced these four obsolete forms of Hebrew letters, just as he found them written in the Hebrew texts of his own time, with (at least sometimes) a superscript stroke. Origen used ΙΙΙΙ, a rough rendering of the current Hebrew letters. Other Greek translators substituted a similarly obscured Greek word with superscript stroke, ΟC or ΚC. This was the starting-point of the Greek use of contractions for 'nomina sacra.' New Testament texts came to use similar symbols (with superscript stroke) for a name like *Ιησοῦς*, although we know that the earlier practice, when this name was abbreviated, was to use the suspension IH. For the early Christian writers found in the number 318 in Gen. xiv. 14 (the number of Abraham's troop), a mystic reference to the cross (T=300) and to the name of Jesus (*ιη*=18). That ΟC and ΚC were the first of these contractions is indicated by the Egyptian magic papyri of the third and fourth centuries (and probably earlier), in which these two symbols are predominant. These magic papyri show Jewish, not Christian, influence. To the original pair, ΟC and ΚC, others were gradually

¹ I noticed several examples lately in the ninth century Florence MS. (Ashb. 1899) of Valerius Maximus. The corrector expands the contraction-symbols for *spiritus* (p. 75, l. 28 κ.), *dominum* (p. 76, l. 26), *spiritus* (p. 78, l. 4), *spiritus* (p. 82, l. 15), *sancitum* (p. 85, l. 12), etc., etc., just as we

should be driven to correct the wrong use of a small initial letter or a large in similar English words. This MS., I should add, comes from Stavelot; while its twin-brother of Ferrières (now in the Berne Library, No. 366), tolerates the wrong use of the contractions in these passages.

added, at the series church.
(e.g. DS f
there are
that the
larly the
Iepostōluk
translator
originals,
which all

This
arguments
pass over
majuscule
that Trau
tractions
about the
substitution
had come
A full his
minuscule
that Trau

After
that as m
opportuni
Boll of H
lungen von
Traube's
famous M
Dr. Paul I
recent inv
sometimes
preface to
a list of t
themselves
an account
bibliograph
(in the to
(1) *Einleit
liefungsga
Halbuncial
Prof. Skutk*

symbols. A when these expand the text, Traube's er, Christian s the reason ri. Quando ntraction of e; it was a

in gold, a Greek and and gold, he d others in purpureus' d of words ISS. was a most holy ent it from aloud, used of using in

When the e see in the te forms of his own ITI, a rough substituted a . This was sacra.' New stroke) for a in this name Christian writers n's troop), a sus ($\eta\eta=18$). tated by the ably earlier), show Jewish, ere gradually

ng use of a small English words from Stavelot; now in the Berne rong use of the

added, at different periods and at different parts of the Greek world, the last in the series being **MHP** for *μήτηρ*, probably at first in the sense of 'mother church.' The limited stock of the Latin imitations of these Greek contractions (e.g. **DS** for Greek **ΘC**, **DNS** or **DMS** for Greek **ΚC**, **SPS** for Greek **ΠNA**, while there are no Latin equivalents of other Greek contractions, e.g. of *οἶμαντος*) suggests that the earliest Latin translations were made from Syrian Greek texts. Similarly the Greek symbol for 'Jerusalem,' **ΙΑΗΜ** (a contraction not of the Greek *Ιεροσόλυμα*, but of the Hebrew form of the name), suggests that the Greek translators took this symbol (and presumably others) from their Hebrew originals, and that the Tetragram was not the isolated Hebrew type, from which all the Greek contractions were formed.

This short outline does not do justice to Traube's detailed statement of his arguments, but may suffice to show something of their strength. I must also pass over the details of his history of the development of contraction in Latin majuscule (partly also in minuscule) script, and content myself with saying that Traube's handling of them shows clearly the great part played by contractions in the corruption of Latin texts. For example, the use (which ceased about the ninth century) of *nō* for 'nostro' has caused in later transcripts the substitution of *non* for *nostro*, since the symbol *nō* at the time of these transcribers had come to denote 'non,' while *nostro* was denoted by the contraction *nrō*. A full history of Latin abbreviations, especially of those current in the earliest minuscule script, is urgently required as a help to textual emendation. Would that Traube had been spared to write it!

After Traube's lamented death in May, 1907, the hope was often expressed that as many of his papers as was possible should be published at the earliest opportunity. The publication has been undertaken by his life-long friend, Prof. Boll of Heidelberg, who has, in the first volume of the *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen von L. Traube*, given us, by way of Preface, a most welcome account of Traube's life and writings. This first volume, containing a selection from the famous Munich lectures on Latin Palaeography, appears under the editorship of Dr. Paul Lehmann. It could not have been put into better hands, for Lehmann's recent investigation into some Itala fragments in the Stuttgart Library comes sometimes very near to the imitable style of his master. Lehmann adds, as a preface to these lectures, a list of the papers left by Traube, and, as an appendix, a list of the extant Latin MSS. in Capital and in Uncial script. The lectures themselves contain a history of Latin Palaeography (from Mabillon onwards), an account of the transition from papyrus to vellum, an enumeration (with a bibliography) of the chief libraries containing Latin MSS., and some remarks (in the tone of the *Nomina Sacra*) on contractions. Future volumes will be (1) *Einleitung in die mittellateinische Philologie*, edited by Lehmann; (2) *Ueberlieferungsgeschichte der römischen Literatur*, edited by Boll; (3) *Geschichte der Halbunciale*, edited by Lehmann; (4) *Gesammelte kleine Schriften*, edited by Prof. Skutsch of Breslau; and (I hope) *Spanische Symptome* (i.e. *añm* for 'autem,'

136. TRAUBE'S NOMINA SACRA AND POSTHUMOUS WORKS

etc.). Traube's wonderful library (with a huge collection of photographs from Latin MSS.) has been acquired for the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, and will be housed in Berlin.

The *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters* are not to be discontinued. Traube utilized them for the 'opuscula' of his pupils. His teeming brain provided an inexhaustible supply of subjects which he had not time to work out himself and which he handed over to others. In his *O Roma Nobilis* (Munich, 1891) he had shown how great was the influence of Sedulius Scottus on ninth century learning and how many MSS. were written by Sedulius himself or his Irish companions. This line of investigation has been followed out by Dr. Hellmann in the first volume of the series, *Sedulius Scottus*. The next volume deals with a kindred theme, *Johannes Scottus*, by Dr. Rand (now at Harvard). Traube's wonderful edition of the Rule of St. Benedict, the ideal for every editor of a Latin text, brought in its train the third volume, *Untersuchungen zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte der ältesten lateinischen Mönchsregeln*, by Dr. Plenkers. Another fruitful suggestion of the master, that the records of sixteenth century Latin scholars would throw light on the original home of many extant (and lost) MSS. of Latin classics, led to Lehmann's *Franciscus Modius*, which is to be followed by other treatises of this kind by the same hand. The other volumes of the series which have appeared as yet are Dr. Becker's *Textgeschichte Lindprands von Cremona*, Dr. Loew's *Die ältesten Kalendarien aus Monte Cassino*, Dr. Neff's *Die Gedichte des Paulus Diaconus*. But there are almost as many more 'overflows' from Traube's flood of discovery which are outside this series. His detection of Lupus of Ferrières as the corrector of the Berne MS. of Valerius Flaccus led to Schnetz's *Ein Kritiker des Valerius Maximus im 9 Jahrhundert* (Neuburg a. D., 1901). His projected edition of Ammianus Marcellinus, after his discovery of the text-tradition, was handed over to Dr. Clark. A hint of his on the lessons to be learnt from a comparison of an uncial archetype, the Puteanus of Livy, with its minuscule transcript in the Vatican, led indirectly to Prof. Shipley's useful booklet on *Certain Sources of Corruption in Latin Manuscripts* (New York, 1904). I mention only a few instances, out of many. Other books of the kind are still to be published—Dr. Loew's account of Beneventan script, Dr. B. A. Mueller's of the 'subscriptions' in Latin MSS. (the traces of ancient editions), etc., etc. What a wonderful record for one who was an invalid for a great part of his life and who died in his forty-sixth year! As I stood some months ago outside his house at Munich I said to myself, 'How many paths have stretched out from this little garden, on this side and on that, into all quarters of the great world of learning!'

W. M. LINDSAY.

HENDER

Civil War and R
of Tacitus.
of Exeter Co
xxiii + 360.

EVERY reader of
the Emperor Ne
Nor will he be d
originality of tre
accurate and th
same novel and ev
at least never fail

The scope o
with the milita
chapters dealing
the Flavian inva

Mr. Henders
his professed aim
and as illustrati
he agrees with t
frequent use is m
not only of what
happen.' The di
course the frequ
were; its dang
modern strategi
crimination to a
point, which ma
application of M
the most part b
men, whose only
possible. The re
subordinate part
inclined to thin
last point. Thus
with a very insu

HENDERSON'S CIVIL WAR AND REBELLION.

Civil War and Rebellion in the Roman Empire. A Companion to the Histories of Tacitus. By BERNARD W. HENDERSON, M.A., Sub-Rector and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford. London: Macmillan & Co. 1908. 8vo. Pp. xxiii + 360. Four Illustrations from Busts, Maps and Plans.

EVERY reader of Mr. Henderson's previous work, *The Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero*, will receive his new book with pleasurable anticipation. Nor will he be disappointed. The book is marked by the same freshness and originality of treatment, the same brilliant, if somewhat florid style, the same accurate and thorough knowledge of his subject, and, we may add, by the same novel and even startling suggestions, which, if they do not always convince, at least never fail to interest and attract.

The scope of the present book is narrower, since it is concerned solely with the military history of the famous 'Four Emperors' Year,' the three chapters dealing respectively with the campaign of Otho and the Vitellians, the Flavian invasion of Italy, and the Rebellion on the Rhine.

Mr. Henderson is an enthusiastic student of modern military history, and his professed aim is 'to write the history of these campaigns by the aid of and as illustrative of modern strategical principles.' With this end in view, he agrees with the aphorism of Von der Goltz, of whose *The Nation in Arms* frequent use is made throughout the book, that 'one ought to write the history not only of what actually happens in a war, but of what was intended to happen.' The difficulty of applying this aphorism to the wars of 69 A.D. is of course the frequent uncertainty as to what the intentions of this or that general were; its danger lies in the temptation to infer his intentions from these modern strategical principles, which cannot always be applied without discrimination to ancient warfare. About these particular wars, too, there is another point, which makes them in some respects unfavourable instances for the application of Mr. Henderson's method. They were civil wars, conducted for the most part by second-rate generals, with very imperfect control over their men, whose only thought was to get at the enemy with as little delay as possible. The result was that strategical considerations played a comparatively subordinate part in the conduct of the campaigns. In a few instances, I am inclined to think, Mr. Henderson has not made sufficient allowance for this last point. Thus, in the case of Spurinna at Placentia, we have a good general with a very insubordinate army, which compels him against his better judgment

to march out into the open plain in the immediate neighbourhood of Caecina's superior force. Mr. Henderson, disregarding the account of Tacitus, which he puts down to camp gossip, attributes to Spurinna the 'intention' of making a 'reconnaissance in force,' and accordingly reconstructs the whole episode (p. 82). Again, in connection with the first battle of Bedriacum, the main factors were the impatience and insubordination of the Othonian soldiers, and the incompetence of Otho, Titianus and Proculus. The result was a reckless frontal attack. Mr. Henderson—I shall have to return to the point—discards all this, and attributes to Otho the 'brilliant conception' of a 'strategical envelopment' of the Vitellian army (p. 100, foll.). Once more, before the second battle of Bedriacum, the eccentric and circuitous march of the leaderless Vitellian army from Hostilia to Cremona is convincingly explained by Mommsen as due, not to strategical considerations, but to temporary loss of head and loss of nerve on the part of the soldiers. Mr. Henderson is not content with this, but attributes the choice of route to a desire to avoid the strategical dangers of the direct road, dangers, which an examination of the details would, I think, show to be imaginary. Much more legitimate, though I think that Mr. Henderson exaggerates his point, is his attribution to Otho, or, as I should put it, his advisers, of an important strategical motive in the dispatch of the fleet to Gallia Narbonensis (p. 90).

Some of Mr. Henderson's excursions into modern military technicalities, though highly interesting and instructive in themselves, have only a shadowy relation to these campaigns. Thus, the disquisition on pages 43 and 44 on the modern methods of defending mountain passes, throws very little light on the question, whether Otho might or might not have blocked the Alps against the Vitellian armies. Again, the dangerous position of an army, compelled 'to form front to a flank' is dwelt upon in connection with the possibility that the Vitellians might, after occupying Placentia, pursue their march to Ariminum (p. 48). But, if the Othonians were still south of the Po, this danger would not be incurred, if they were already north of the Po, the Vitellians could have no possible motive in marching to Ariminum.

But Mr. Henderson's main object of illustrating these campaigns by modern strategy is inextricably mixed up with another. Tacitus did not realise these strategical principles, and besides, Tacitus has been 'for all time' labelled by Mommsen as 'the most unmilitary of historians.' Accordingly, a great deal of Mr. Henderson's work, though mostly in the first chapter, is taken up with criticising the blindness, short-sightedness, shallowness, and incapacity of Tacitus in matters military. I have found it impossible within the limits of a review to do justice to this subject, and I have therefore dealt with it more fully in an article in the *Journal of Philology* (Vol. xxxi, No. 61). But no review of the book can leave quite untouched the most original, the most brilliant, but also the most untenable of his theories, the explanation of the first 'Battle of Bedriacum.'

Now ev
Plutarch, po
Hist. ii. 40
Mr. Henders
absolutely ne
ceived the b
be made the
the north of
the Adua, t
'simultaneou
Cremona wo
the lines on

1. Was
which any
(p. 111), ad
immobility b
the express
watching for

2. Is the
army, on w
strategic en
is absolutely

Mr. H
abandoned.
of the sche
'ad quartu
miles distan
that they, w
who would
and were a
is not prom
the figures,
but wholly
decimum' (p
Henderson
mile extra
a complete
(pp. 116 and
have come
misundersto
theory can
the *Journal*
to substitu

Caecina's which he making a de (p. 82). sectors were the incom- less frontal as all this, 'development' battle of lian army due, not of nerve this, but dangers of I think, that Mr. I should ch of the nicalities, shadowy 4 on the t on the gainst the 'to form that the arimumin er would d have y modern isise these spelled by great deal taken up capacity of nits of a it more But no the most n of the

Now every word, I think I may say without exception, in Tacitus and Plutarch, points to a reckless frontal attack, except the well-known *crux* in Hist. ii. 40 'confluentes Padi et Aduae fluminum—petebant.' On these words Mr. Henderson builds his theory. Otho, of whose military capacity we know absolutely nothing except from his supposed action in the present case, conceived the brilliant idea of a strategical envelopment of Cremona, which was to be made the *Metz* of the campaign. The Bedriacum force was to pass round the north of Cremona by a close flanking movement, and reach the mouth of the Adua, thus cutting communications with Gaul. At the same time, by a 'simultaneous movement' the Danube army was to occupy Bedriacum, so that Cremona would be enveloped and forced to capitulate. I can here only indicate the lines on which this theory must be tested.

1. Was this flank march, considering the numbers on the two sides, one which any sane general could have contemplated? Mr. Henderson himself (p. 111), admits that 'all depended on the immobility of the enemy.' This immobility he assumes, contrary to all probability, and in utter disregard of the express statement of Tacitus, that the Vitellians were keenly alert and watching for the first false move (ii. 34).

2. Is there any evidence for the simultaneous movement of the Danube army, on which, as Mr. Henderson again admits (p. 106), 'the whole idea of strategic envelopment depended'? I have tried to show elsewhere that there is absolutely none. If so, the whole theory falls like a house of cards.

Mr. Henderson admits that the idea was for one reason or another abandoned. But he makes a very ingenious attempt to find the initial stages of the scheme in Tacitus. According to Tacitus, the Othonians first encamped 'ad quartum a Bedriaco.' Next day, they started for the confluence, sixteen miles distant, in spite of the objections of Paulinus, who urged the certainty that they, weary with so long a march, would be attacked by the Vitellians, who would have barely four miles to traverse (ii. 40). They started however, and were attacked on the Postumian road, a few miles from Cremona. This is not promising material out of which to get the great flank movement, and the figures, 4, 16, and 4 cannot all stand. Mr. Henderson adopts the heroic, but wholly illegitimate course of altering 'ad quartum' into 'ad quartum decimum' (p. 345). From this point, the confluence is fifteen miles, but Mr. Henderson gets the sixteen by allowing the quite impossible margin of one mile extra for the flank march. The four miles of Paulinus are explained by a complete distortion and misrepresentation of what Tacitus makes him urge (pp. 116 and 345). The flank march is abandoned, partly because the Othonians have come too far along the road, partly because Otho's final orders are misunderstood. It seems to me that by methods of interpretation like this any theory can be proved or disproved. The suggestion which I make myself in the *Journal of Philology* is to read 'Hadrae' (the modern Arda) for 'Aduae,' and to substitute for the 'ad quartum' of Tacitus the fifty stades of Plutarch, a

preference for which there is some reason. With these two changes, all the other figures, the sixteen miles of Tacitus, the one hundred stades of Plutarch, and the four miles of Paulinus sufficiently well fit in. It is true that the matter resolves itself into a frontal attack, but the word 'Aduae' is the single obstacle to such a view, which is otherwise strongly supported by both Plutarch and Tacitus.

Of Mr. Henderson's three chapters, the first is perhaps the most interesting and the most exciting, because it is the most controversial. In the last two chapters Mr. Henderson is content, with some few exceptions, to follow the general guidance of Tacitus, filling up gaps and explaining obscurities with an acuteness and lucidity which make his work an invaluable 'Companion to the Histories.' But the very excellence of these chapters should, I think, make us hesitate before accepting Mommsen's exaggerated epigram that Tacitus is the most unmilitary of historians. Whether he was too fond of following camp gossip, as Mr. Henderson suggests, is a wide question, and requires more discussion than he gives to it.

At the close of his book, and in connection with 'the results in the Roman army,' arising from the troubles in Gaul and Germany, Mr. Henderson touches upon the fringe of two important questions,

1. The recruiting system for the Legions, and
2. The employment of 'Clan Regiments.'

He is well qualified to deal with both these subjects thoroughly, and I wish that he would do so, but his remarks here are not as clear or as free from misunderstanding as could be desired.

1. In the first place, he commits himself to the following, as it seems to me, astounding statement. 'The Emperor Augustus had sought to establish the general practice that recruits for legions serving in the Western part of the Empire should be drawn from the Eastern Provinces, and that legions on duty in the latter should be recruited from the West' (p. 324). This sweeping and, as far as I know, original statement is not supported by a single reference. I can only point out very briefly one or two objections to it. It is wholly opposed to the conclusions arrived at by Mommsen in his well-known article on the subject, in *Hermes* xix. All the epigraphic evidence collected there, as well as several passages from the *Annals*, point to exactly the opposite practice. The Eastern legions were recruited from the East, the Western from the West, while those of Moesia seem to have been raised from both. Mr. Henderson may say that Augustus was unable to carry his policy into effect. But it was from the first an obviously impossible policy, which Augustus could never have thought of. There were only six Eastern Legions and, omitting the Moesian, fifteen or sixteen in the West. Even for the six legions, there were not enough Roman citizens in the East to recruit them in the ordinary way, and in consequence the Eastern legions were very largely 'vernaculae,' *i.e.* composed of Orientals, who up to the time of enlistment were 'peregrini.' Is it conceivable

that August
for the Rhine

Again,
German Le

territorial s
camps inv

children of
so closely t

As a resu
German sy

system, I b

the view th

legionaries
Vespasian,

is there any

sympathies.

their disloy

feelings of
vel externu

end, it was

his German

service in a

are example

legions. It

war as to th

'in the sys

made any c

2. With

an importa

the need fo

well as som

armies. Th

practice of

Vespasian, a

and Gallic

Mr. Hender

auxiliaries i

were usual

levies' I rat

ing of the

as he coul

curator of F

distinguishe

ges, all the
of Plutarch,
e that the
s the single
th Plutarch

that Augustus could ever have contemplated a 'vernacular' army of this kind for the Rhine, the Danube, and Spain?

Again, Mr. Henderson explains the mutinous and disloyal behaviour of the German Legions in the year 69 by what he calls 'the introduction of the territorial system' into the army. He believes that the system of permanent camps involved recruiting from 'the children of the Legion,' and even from the children of the auxiliaries, and that 'so a legion and a locality became identified so closely that the interests and hopes of the latter became those of the former.' As a result, 'the legions on the Rhine in A.D. 69 were tainted with native German sympathies' (pp. 323 and 325). Now, with regard to the territorial system, I believe I am right in saying that epigraphic evidence is all against the view that strictly local recruiting was earlier than Hadrian. The German legionaries came from Gaul, especially Narbonensis, Spain, Noricum, and up to Vespasian, from Italy. Nor, though the circumstances were wholly exceptional, is there any evidence that the legions on the Rhine were tainted with German sympathies. Their mutinous conduct was due to the licence of civil war, while their disloyalty was either due to absolute compulsion, or again to the bitter feelings of civil strife. They were Vitellian legions, and 'Vitellianae legiones vel externum servitium quam imperatorem Vespasianum malle' (iv. 54). In the end, it was to the Gallic Empire that they swore allegiance, not to Civilis and his Germans. I make bold to say that there is no evidence whatever that long service in a province, whether Britain or Spain or Germany or Africa, and there are examples of it in all these, was the cause of danger or disloyalty among the legions. It is surely a somewhat lame conclusion to the lesson learnt in this war as to the dangers of the recruiting system, that Mr. Henderson has to admit, 'in the system of recruiting for the legions, Vespasian is not known to have made any change.'

2. With regard to the auxiliary troops along the Rhine, Vespasian did make an important change, and Mr. Henderson explains very clearly what it was, and the need for it (p. 329). A considerable number of Gallic cohorts and alae as well as some drawn from German tribes were employed in both the German armies. The possible dangers of this are obvious, and were increased by the practice of putting these corps under the command of their own countrymen. Vespasian, as Mr. Henderson shows, with a few exceptions, removed these German and Gallic auxiliaries to other provinces, further from their own homes. But if Mr. Henderson implies by his phrase, 'the practice of using clan regiments for auxiliaries in their native country,' that the auxilia generally up to this time were usually so posted, or that they may be collectively described as 'local levies,' I rather demur to this view. I notice that, e.g., Mr. Henderson in speaking of the procurator of Raetia says: 'his only troops were such native levies as he could raise in case of sudden peril' (p. 29). On the contrary, the procurator of Raetia had a considerable force of auxiliary cohorts and alae, carefully distinguished in ii. 68 from the native levies: 'Raetiae alae cohortesque et ipsorum

Raetorum iuventus.' Does Mr. Henderson suppose that these alae and cohorts were all composed of Raeti, or that the nineteen cohorts and five alae in the Mauretanian provinces (ii. 52) were all composed of Mauretanian tribesmen, or that the auxiliaries of Noricum were all native levies, as is implied on page 162? We have unfortunately no 'diplomata' for the prae-Flavian period, but even in the Rhine army we have enough information to know that it was not the rule there to employ clan regiments in their own homes. The Batavian cohorts were at this time not part of the German army at all, but of the British. When they did belong to the German army they were stationed in Upper, not in Lower Germany. Belgae too are found in the upper army, Treveri on the Lower Rhine. Again, cohorts of Raeti, Thracians, Vascones, Britons, and of other tribes from more distant provinces are found in the Rhine armies, just as Gallic cohorts and alae are found in Britain and Pannonia. From the first, Tacitus tells us, (*Ann.* iv. 5,) the auxilia moved about from province to province more frequently than the legions, a statement quite inconsistent with the theory that they were all this time merely local levies.

Whether Mommsen is right in holding that in course of time the auxiliary soldiers 'served without distinction as to their descent in the most various divisions,' or whether, according to Mr. Henderson, the clan regiments 'presumably continued to be composed, at least largely (? entirely), of the natives of those tribes whose names they bear,' is a question which can only be decided by a careful examination of diplomata and other inscriptions. My impression is that Mommsen does not speak without book, but perhaps Mr. Henderson has collected counter evidence. The clan names prove no more than such a cognomen as 'Gallica' applied to a Syrian legion.

Among minor points, I would notice the following. On page 32 we are told that there were 'nine cohorts of Praetorian Guards, and seven of Urban Guards.' This implies that the increase made by Claudius affected the urban cohorts only, and not the praetorian. It is not the ordinary view, nor, I think, in accordance with the evidence. At any rate, Mr. Henderson must be wrong in saying, page 34, 'Under Tiberius, Cohors XVII is in garrison at Lugdunum.' At that time, it must have been cohors XIII.

It appears from ii. 57, that Vitellius was joined before entering Italy by eight thousand troops from Britain. Mr. Henderson on p. 166 supposes that in response to an appeal from Vitellius, further detachments were sent 'in time to take part in the struggle.' This is a mistake. The 'Vexillarii trium Britannicarum legionum,' in ii. 100, are clearly those led into Italy by Vitellius himself.

On page 214 Mr. Henderson supposes that the *legio II Adiutrix* which 'was formally enrolled by Mucianus,' was formed from the '*legio e classicis*,' a body of marines collected by Vitellius from the Misenum fleet (iii. 55). This is of course possible, but I would suggest as far more probable that it was formed from the '*classici Ravennates legionarium militiam poscentes*,' who

joined the
distinct
legion s

On
Germ. 21
populi.'

On
'fell up
does not
compelle
not a ca
appealed
camp, wh
says that
(iv. 61).

Of s
footnote
on page

I on
Messrs. M
which I

joined the army of Antonius (iii. 50). In that case, the promotion would be a distinct reward of service rendered. There seems no reason why the Vitellian legion should be so honoured.

On page 256 Mr. Henderson says, 'the Nemetes were Gauls.' Tacitus, *Germ.* 28, classes them among the tribes which were 'haud dubie Germanorum populi.'

On page 288 Mr. Henderson says that Tutor, after the death of Vocula, 'fell upon Cologne and Mainz, and took them both without trouble.' Tacitus does not say that he took either place. He says that he surrounded them, and compelled them to acknowledge the Gallic empire (iv. 59). Cologne was clearly not a captured city when it negotiated with the Tencteri (iv. 64), or when it appealed for the help of Cerealis (iv. 79). Mainz was as clearly not a captured camp, when the Ala Picentina took refuge there (iv. 62), while Tacitus expressly says that Mogontiacum and Vindonissa were not burnt with the other camps (iv. 61).

Of slips or misprints, I have only noticed two. Legio I. Italica is in a footnote on page 167 mentioned as one of the legions of Lower Germany, while on page 278 Novaesium is described as 'north' of Vetera.

I only wish that all books were printed in the large clear type in which Messrs. Macmillan have presented Mr. Henderson's work. It is the only book which I have been able to read through myself during the past three years.

E. G. HARDY.

BIANCA BRUNO'S THIRD SAMNITE WAR.

BIANCA BRUNO, *La terza guerra Sannitica*, (*Studi di storia antica*, pubblicati da Giulio Beloch, fascicolo vi). Rome: Loescher, 1906. Pp. 122. Lire 5.50.

THE book before us is a careful history of the Third Samnite War and the few years immediately preceding it (304-290 B.C.). The only continuous narrative of this war is Livy ix. 45 to end, x., and *Per. xi*, so that the book practically resolves itself into an analysis of the Livian account, as presented in Livy himself and the epitomists. Outside Livy the only sources available are the epitaph of Scipio Barbatus (*C.I.L.* i. p. 16), a few incidental notices in Frontinus, Valerius Maximus, and the *de uris illustribus*, a sentence or two in Pliny, Cicero, etc., and the *Fasti Triumphales*. The writer shows a very keen eye for any fragment of evidence which may be used to correct or to fill up the Livian narrative. To a certain extent the *Fasti Triumphales* are valuable in this respect; they sometimes give help towards discarding some of the grosser inconsistencies of Livy. Unfortunately they are not much nearer the truth, dating as they do from 12 B.C. They reflect the same tendencies as Livy's narrative; exaggeration, glorification of self, family and country have played havoc with dull fact; one would hesitate to say that they drew from sources purer than, or even different from those available to Livy.

Thus for her main theory Bianca Bruno relies on such few and faint glimpses of an older and truer version as may be caught sight of through the thick overlay of annalistic tradition. This theory may be shortly stated: in very early historical accounts there was a constant verbal confusion between *Sabini* and *Samnites*; the greater importance of the conflict with the Samnites almost completely obscured that with the Sabines; a true reconstruction of the Third Samnite war would make the Sabines very prominent; in fact, it is by no means certain that they did not begin the war, yet, owing largely to the verbal confusion mentioned, their action as enemies of Rome only appears late in the war, and then obscurely, e.g. in Liv. *Per. xi*, Oros. iii. 22, 11, Flor. i. 15, *auctor de uris illustr. 33. 3* (*M. Curius Dentatus*), Cic. *Cato m.* 16, 55; Apul. *de mag.* 17. The supposition that the hostility of the Sabines to Rome should be thrown back to the beginning of the war, is attractive and seems to have grown from the author's thorough examination of the sources, not to have been preconceived and then propped up by selected quotations. Perhaps she shows a tendency to work her idea rather hard, but on the whole it presents itself as a very reasonable solution of many difficulties in the Livian narrative.

As she notes
connection
attacking
Moreover, if
it is easier to
they must
Second San
blow for fre

Perhaps
problem ro
the risk of
other critic
summed up
There

As she notes, the geographical position of the Sabines would ensure the necessary connection between the war in the north, where Gauls and Etruscans were attacking Rome, and that in the south, where the Samnites were fighting. Moreover, if the initiative in forcing on this war is attributed to the Sabines, it is easier to understand how the Samnites came to break the peace of 304 B.C. ; they must have been greatly exhausted by the tremendous struggle of the Second Samnite War, but could not resist the temptation of striking one more blow for freedom when another nation gave the signal.

Perhaps even the writer would not claim that her book had finally solved the problem round which it centres; such reconstructions of ancient narrative run the risk of being discarded, as soon as a newer or better idea occurs to some other critic. For the sake of clearness we could have wished that she had summed up her results more definitely at the end of each chapter.

There is an appendix on the chronology of Polybius during the Gallic wars.

LOUISE E. MATTHAEI.

A SKETCH BOOK OF ANCIENT ROME (OF THE SCHOOL OF DOMENICO GHIRLANDAIO).

Codex Escurialensis, ein Skizzenbuch aus der Werkstatt Domenico Ghirlandaio's, unter Mitwirkung von CHRISTIAN HÜLSEN und ADOLF MICHAELIS, herausgegeben von HERMANN EGGER. (Sonderschriften des österr. archäol. Instituts in Wien, iv. 1906.) 2 vols. 4to. I. Text: 174 pp. with 3 plates and 70 illustrations in the text. II. Plates: 70 plates with 137 illustrations.

THE publication in facsimile of the more important drawings of Renaissance artists which have relation to the antiquities of Rome has been one of the features of the study of Roman archaeology and topography in recent years. It is in this manner that *rapprochements* can best be made between these various drawings, which are scattered over the museums and libraries of Europe, and the monuments which they represent, and the perusal of such a work as Prof. Hülsen's concluding volume of Jordan's *Topographie der Stadt Rom* (C.R. 1908, 154 sqq.) will show the utility of such publications, while their interest as showing the development of these artists themselves, and informing us what were the objects of their study, is no less great. Among them, that of the book of drawings attributed to Andreas Coner in the Soane Museum (*Papers of the British School at Rome*, ii. (1904)) by the present writer, brought before the public a series hitherto unknown. That the attribution, though only put forward tentatively, is impossible, has been demonstrated to my satisfaction by Herr Egger himself in a review in *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen* (*Beiblatt der Mitteilungen des Instituts für österr. Geschichtsforschung*, 1906, No. 3). Coner, as the inventory of his books shows, was a priest and a considerable scholar, to whom the numerous errors in the Latinity of the text to the drawings themselves cannot be attributed. It seems also clear that Herr Egger is correct in his statement that the drawings, as we have them, are not originals (neither those of the first nor of the second hand), but go back to older collections. This is indicated by the fact that several of the plans and profiles are to be found in other contemporary collections of drawings, e.g. the Codex Barberinianus of Giuliano da Sangallo, so closely resembling those of the so-called Coner as to indicate their derivation from a common archetype, and by the incorrect copying of some of the legends, obviously by one who did not understand them, which makes it difficult to suppose that this was itself the archetype.

I have referred to these points, because the case in regard to the Codex

Escurialensis is identical. There, too, the draughtsman is only a copyist, as similar indications show. Herr Egger has, by a series of very careful comparisons, demonstrated that he was a scholar of Domenico Ghirlandaio, and that some of the originals he copied were probably the architectural drawings and sketches of buildings made at Rome, as Vasari tells us, by his master (pp. 35 *sqq.*). (That Michelangelo, as Condivi tells us in a passage cited by Herr Egger, unsuccessfully (*sic*) attempted to borrow Domenico's sketch-book, is an interesting point.) His identity cannot, however, be more closely determined, as there is not a single independent conception by him in the whole book (p. 47).

The drawings of plans, and details of architecture and ornamentation and some of those of ancient sculptures, are equally taken from older pattern-books, the authorship of which it has not as yet been possible to determine. The date of the sketch-book itself is not earlier than 1491, the year given on an ornamental pilaster on f. 50v. It is thus some 25 years earlier than the Coner drawings, and is almost the first of its kind which has come down to us. The most important drawings in it are, undoubtedly, the views of Rome, which date from about this period, and are especially interesting in comparison with those drawn by Heemskerck some 40 years later. Some of them have been already published separately by Müntz and Hülsen.

The drawings are, from p. 57 onwards, carefully described in detail—Herr Egger himself, who is entirely responsible for the introduction (pp. 5–56) dealing with those of architectural or artistic interest, Prof. Hülsen with many of the views of Rome, Prof. Michaelis with the sculptures. The combination of specialists is indeed a fortunate one, and the responsibility for the respective sections is clearly apportioned in a table at the end, which also shows when the drawing is taken from another drawing, and when direct from the original. The drawings themselves are fully reproduced in vol. ii., while in vol. i. we find numerous illustrations from other drawings or engravings which form parallels to those of the codex under notice. We may note the following as more especially interesting :

Fol. 7. The view of the interior of the mausoleum of Constantia (S. Costanza near S. Agnese), with its decorations as they were before the restoration of 1620—in the lower zone marble intarsia like that of the basilica of Junius Bassus.

Fol. 7 v., 8. Panorama of Rome from Monte Mario, especially interesting in comparison with the later panoramas from the same point by Heemskerck and Wyngaerde. The battlemented tower in front of the Hospital of S. Spirito cannot be satisfactorily identified. The representation of the Vatican palace is interesting.

Fol. 10. A detail from the so-called 'volta dorata,' a ceiling in the Golden House of Nero, which formed the subject of a fine coloured drawing by Francesco d' Olanda (reproduced on Pl. III. of the text volume), whose sketch-book in the Escurial will, we may hope, one day also be published by Herr Egger. Other details of ceilings from the Golden House follow.

Fol. 15 v. has a drawing of a sarcophagus in the church of the SS. Apostoli, with a representation of sea deities, which has since disappeared, and is otherwise unknown.

Fol. 23 (3). I do not think the identification of this base with that of the columns of the portico of S. Venanzio at the Lateran baptistery is correct. See Coner (so called), fol. 132 (a).

Fol. 26 v. Interesting view of the castle and bridge of S. Angelo before the alterations of Alexander VI. (1492-5). There is another view of the castle on f. 30 v.

Fol. 27 v. View of the Pons Fabricius and the Tiber island. It is noticeable that this and the last view recur identically in the Codex Barberinianus at Giuliano da Sangallo (f. 34 v) in such a way that a common original for both must be supposed. Figs. 68, 70, inserted at the end of the text volume, and giving two different views of the same bridge from engravings by Willem van Nieulandt in my collection, form further interesting parallels.

Fol. 35. Elevation of the apse of SS. Cosma and Damiano, with its original marble incrustedation, destroyed probably in 1632.

Fol. 40 v. View from the northern summit of the Capitol over the eastern portion of the city, with the mediaeval Tor dei Conti in the centre, reproduced on a larger scale in the text volume, pl. iv.

Fol. 41 v. View of the Colosseum, absolutely identical with a drawing in the Soane Museum (vol. marked 'Margaret Chinnery', fol. 28). A similar identity is to be noted between fol. 29 of the Cod. Escurialensis and f. 6 of the vol. marked 'Margaret Chinnery.'

Fol. 48. Elevation of the Tomb of Bibulus. That in the so-called Coner sketch-book is by the second hand.

Fol. 53. Drawing of the Apollo Belvedere, the oldest we have. The text informs us that it then stood in the garden of S. Pietro in Vincoli. Michaelis succeeds in disproving Hülser's theory that it was found near Marino. Another drawing is on fol. 64, and Michaelis decides from an examination of them that the incorrect restoration of the lower part of the right arm, which already appears here, dates from classical times.

Fol. 56. Lower part of a statue of Jupiter in the collection of Giovanni Ciampolini, one of the earliest formed in Rome. Michaelis has succeeded in recognizing the torso in the Naples Museum.

Fol. 56 v. (reproduced on a larger scale in Pl. V. of the text volume). View of Rome from the Aventine.

Fol. 60. Part of a ceiling in the Golden House of Nero—plan only of the compartments. This is more fully represented in Cod. Windsor H. 22 (Vittoria) f. 20 (21 Lanciani) and Bellori-Bartoli, *Picturae Antiquae, Animadversiones in Appendicem*, tab. v., as I discovered this summer.

It will be recognized from this short account that the publication is one of the highest importance, and it is good to know that others will follow it. The Vatican Library, which in 1902 acquired the Barberini Library *en bloc*, is

about to p
by Prof. F
publish th
have alrea
tions as a
hopes to b
of this co
collection
Alessandr
Windsor—
consent.

SS. Apostoli, appeared, and in that of the baptistery is to before the view of the is noticeable Barberinianus mon original end of the bridge from form further in its original the eastern in the centre, drawing in (A similar trialensis and called Coner e. The text o in Vincoli. is found near sides from an the lower part from classical of Giovanni as succeeded (ume). View only of the Windsor H. 22 *Antique*, summer. nation is one will follow it. *en bloc*, is

about to publish the drawings of Giuliano da Sangallo in facsimile, with text by Prof. Hülsen, and there are grounds for hoping that Herr Egger will shortly publish the Heemskerck sketch-books in Berlin. Isolated drawings from these have already appeared in various articles and books, but the issue of the collections as a whole will be of great interest. The British School at Rome, too, hopes to bear its part in making known the treasures which exist in the libraries of this country, and I am now engaged in the formation of a catalogue of the collection of drawings begun by Cassiano dal Pozzo, and purchased from Cardinal Alessandro Albani by George III., which are now in the Royal Library at Windsor—an enterprise for which H.M. the King has graciously given his consent.

THOMAS ASHBY.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

Rheinisches Museum, etc. 63. 4. 1908.

S. Sudhaus, *Die Abfassungszeit des Alexandra*. The last twelve lines bear out the date suggested by Beloch and Skutsch: 1446 *sqq.* refer to Flamininus and Cynoscephalae. A. v. Mess, *Das 68 Gedicht Catulls*. Allius asks Catullus to send him love poetry of his own composition which will console him and help to reconcile his mistress to him. This last thought is an elegiac *rōmos*. H. Raeder, *Alkidamas und Platon als Gegner des Isokrates*. 1. Against Gercke's article, *Rh. Mus.* 62. 171 *sqq.* His interpretation of Alc. 4 and Isocr. 13. 9-12 quite mistaken: it is Isocrates, not an 'old *rēxyn*' that Alc. is attacking. 2. Gompertz wrong in thinking that Isocrates' Cyprian speeches and *Busiris* display a tone friendly to Plato. H. Rabe, *Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften*. 1. Further sources for the text of Johannes Diaconus. 2. Georgius' commentary on Hermogenes' *orātor*: two chapters edited with critical apparatus based on *Py*, *Ya*, *Vy*. 3. A Madrid MS., once the property of Const. Lascaris, and containing extracts from Christophorus' commentary. L. Rademacher, *Motiv und Persönlichkeit*. 2. Vergil's description of the punishments in Hell. In general, the penalties in Hell are the outcome of popular legend and humour: they were not originally connected with particular individuals such as Sisyphus and Tantalus. In the oldest tradition we find the task of pouring water into leaky vessels assigned to unnamed maidens: its becoming the peculiar penalty of the Danaids is connected with the fact that in folklore eternal water-carrying is the duty of the *άγαιοι*. No need then to decide exactly where in *Aen.* 6. 608 *sqq.* the transition from ordinary mortal sinners to mythical ones takes place. R. M. E. Meister, *Eideshelfer im griech. Rechte*. Passages from Aristotle, Gortynian Insc., etc., which suggest the existence of persons who confirmed the oaths of the parties to the suit by an oath based on knowledge not of the facts involved, but of the characters of the parties. A. Dyroff, *Caesars Anticato und Ciceros Cato*. Caesar's work described Cato as a man in whom all the Stoic virtues were distorted. Influence of Cicero's work upon Valerius Maximus and in particular Seneca. The Cato poems of the *Poetae Lat. Minores*. R. Reitzenstein, *Die Inselfahrt der Ciris*. The Vergil lines 473-4 and 476. Difficulties arise in the matter (for Minos had no object in seeking Delos) and style (*linguitur* and the *que's* in 476) at the very moment at which the narrative becomes Vergilian. A. Brinkmann, *Die Homer-Metaphrasen des Prokopius von Gaza*. The thought of Homer M. 322 *sqq.* paraphrased in an anonymous writer in Iamblichus, pseudo-Lysias, Theopompus, Cicero, Lesbonax, Procopius and Nicolaus Cabasilas. *Miscellen*: T. Gompertz, *Zu Herodot 2. 16*. Read $\eta \gamma \alpha \delta \eta$ for $\omega \gamma \alpha \delta \eta$. Idem, *War Archimedes von königl. Gebüüte?* Explains Plutarch's $\tau \omega \beta \alpha \omega \kappa \epsilon \sigma \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \nu$ (*Vit. Marc.* 14. 7) as a title of rank. J. M. Stahl, *Zu Fragmenten des Euripides*. Emeniations of Euripides fragments published by Rabe, *Rh. Mus.* 1908, 127 *sqq.* (esp. from *Bellerophon*). R. Asmus, *Zur Textkritik von Julian. Or. IV*. A. Brinkmann, *Zu Julians IV Rede*. G. Némethy, *Tibulliana*. 1. 6. 56 *admittas* is used in its regular amatory sense; 2. 2. 7 *Syrio* to be read for *puro*; 2. 3. 71-72: cp. *Lucr.* 5. 962. C. Huelsen, *Ein Vers des Martial und eine stadtromische Grabschrift*. Confirms Housman's

note on Mart.
to be the epita.
K. Meiser, Zu
means 'water'
a constant ep.
king was inve.
got their name
Stücke mit Sc.

Neue J.

J. Ilberg
the relations
Medicorum.
im Aitertum.
The hypothes.
2. Earthquak.
world. ? Soc.
Mitteilungen:
Judentum un
erudition and

21. 10.

E. Web.
and differen.
and Cyrus af.
M. Wellmann
account of
Die Vorträge.
Professional
P. Simon, L.
griech. *Apolo*
to his work

23. 1.

W. Nes.
v. Chr. The
of the influ.
foundation
Antiphon, e.
Of these, o.
weak and n.
extent Socr.
superior min.
Chalcedon
(esp. Critias
Epode und
niger: the
prophet for
Ll. 49, 50
that the E

note on Mart. 3. 93. 20 (*Class. Rev.* 1908, p. 46) from *C.I.L.* vi. 9590, which he believes to be the epitaph of this long-lived lady's doctor: C · MATTIO · LYGDAMO · MEDICO · SATTIAE. K. Meiser, *Zu Juvenal 15. 90*. Read *audi* for *autem*. H. Ehrlich, *König Ogyges*. 'Ογύγος means 'watery': the *Attic* king an invention to explain ὡγύης κακά ('the Deluge'): as a constant epithet of Στρυός νῆσος the word came to mean 'chthonic' and the *Boeotian* king was invented in conn. with the Ogygian gate, grove and hill at Thebes which really got their name from the Furies who were worshipped there as ὡγύγαι νύμφαι. E. Nestle, *Sücke mit Schlangenhaut*. A. Elter, *Zusatz zu o. S.* 472.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, etc. 21. 9. 1908.

J. Ilberg, *Die Erforschung der griech. Heilkunde*. Some account of the history of the relations between Philology and Medicine, in connexion with the new *Corpus Medicorum*. Soranus. Hints for a history of ancient Medicine. W. Capelle, *Erdbeben im Altertum*. 1. Earthquakes in Greece: the connexion of the Poseidon cult therewith. The hypotheses of ancient scientists, esp. Democritus, Anaxagoras, Aristotle and Posidonius. 2. Earthquakes in Italy. Roman superstition. 3. Earthquakes in other parts of the world. ?Sodom and Gomorrah. R. Asmus, *Eichendorffs 'Julian.'* *Anzeigen und Mitteilungen*: Wendland's *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zum Judentum und Christentum* reviewed by Zielinski. 'All that great power, wide-read erudition and sure judgment could do for such a theme.'

21. 10. 1908.

E. Weber, *Herodot als Dichter*. Epic breadth of the historian, points of similarity and difference between him and Homer. Comp. of the conversation between Croesus and Cyrus after the release from the pyre with that of Priam and Achilles in *Il.* 22. 372 sqq. M. Wellmann, *Asklepiades aus Bithynien von einem herrschenden Vorurtheil befreit*. Pliny's account of him as a charlatan unreliable. Account of his physiology. B. Warnecke, *Die Vortragskunst der römischen Schauspieler*. Strength of voice not helped by the masks. Professional voice-training. Many hints to be found in Quint. and the Terence-scholia. P. Simon, *Die Huldigung der Kunste. Anzeigen und Mitteilungen*: J. Geffcken's *Zwei griech. Apologeten* reviewed by P. Wendland. 'G. has done a great service. . . . I owe to his work most valuable suggestions.'

23. 1. 1909.

W. Nestle, *Politik und Aufklärung in Griechenland im Ausgang des V Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* The pseudo-Xenophontic 'State of the Athenians' the first attempt at an examination of the influence of natural laws upon forms of constitution. The Sophists laid the foundation of a theory of Political Science, but whereas the views of Protagoras, Antiphon, etc., were not revolutionary, those of the adherents of Natural Law were. Of these, one section (Hippias, Lycophron, Alcidamas) pleaded for the majority of weak and needy persons, the other (Thrasymachus and Callicles in Plato, and to some extent Socrates) regard law as protecting an inferior majority against an intellectually superior minority. Sketches of ideal states by Hippodamus of Miletus and Phaleas of Chalcedon. Results of these theories: the oligarchic revolution of 411, the thirty tyrants (esp. Critias), the deaths of Theramenes and Socrates, Caesarism. F. Skutsch, *Sechzehnte Epode und vierte Ekloge*. Ll. 13 sqq. refer to the burial of Romulus and the *lapis niger*: the conception is illustrated by a passage of Julius Valerius (3. 57) in which a prophet foretells that the city in which Alexander is buried will endure for ever. Ll. 49, 50 and 33 closely resemble Verg. *Ecl.* 4. 21, 22: the latter is the imitator, so that the Epode may be dated between 42 B.C. and 40 B.C., and we need assume no

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

allusion to *Carm. Sibyll.* 3. 790 sqq. A Müller, *Das Bühnenwesen in der Zeit von Constantin d. Gr. bis Justinian.* Deals mainly with mimes and pantomimes, the life and status of the players. R. M. Meyer, *Die Methode der wechselseitigen Erhellung. Anzeigen und Mitteilungen*: K. Dissel, *Der Sperling der Lesbia. Passer solitarius, not p. domesticus: ὄπρωβος πονός* of Psalm 102 is rendered in the Vulgate *passer solitarius*, and the latter name may have been current in Catullus' time. T. Plüss, *Ein Vorschlag zu Donarem pateras.* Maintains the genuineness, with explanations of the difficulties (e.g. officially the burning of Carthage was due to that city's breach of the treaty made by the elder Africanus, *lucratus nomina*: 'gaining no personal advantage'). Zieliński's *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte* summarised and favourably noticed by E. Grünwald.

Archiv für lat. Lexikographie, etc. 15. 4. 1908.

Oskar Hey, *Wortgeschichtliche Beobachtungen.* The use of *ut ita dicam*, mainly in Cicero, where it accompanies (a) new words, (b) new meanings, (c) *uerba humilia*, (d) oxymoron. Idem, *Zur Assimilation von ct. Coatores in Corpus 5. 4504, 455-N. Vulii. Redire, reuerti, reducem esse.* In Spartan's *Vita Hadr.* 1. 3 *ad patriam reddit* the verb is used of a person returning to the country which he has never seen before; so *reduces* in Verg. *Aen.* 3. 96. Th. Bügel, *Ein Fall seltener Tmesis.* In the case of compounds of the form *pseudo-apostoli*, *ps.-christiani*, and compounds of *de*, *tmesis* was permissible in the time of Ambrosiaster and Verecundus. S. Brassloff, *Über den Gebrauch von *proinde* und *perinde* bei den klass. Juristen.* Generally, *proinde* is 'therefore,' *perinde* 'according as': occasionally the meanings are interchanged. In *Dig.* 42. 1. 57 *proinde* appears to have neither meaning, but the passage wants rearranging and it is easy to do this in such a way that the particle has its usual force. But in seven passages of the *Digest* where *perinde=deinde* there is good reason to believe the presence of interpolation (by Justinian). P. Rasi, *Manere=esse.* A. Klotz, *Incessare.* Eutyches cites it from *Statius 11. 361*, where QNgfrb present it. In view, however, of the poet's classicist principles, it is not likely that he used the word. Idem, *Die Statiussscholien.* The first *Statius* commentaries came into existence about 400. About 550 Lactantius Placidus used these for his work on the poets which lasted until Carolingian times, when it was broken up into marginal scholia. These again were collected and written out continuously without the text in *Monac.* 19482 and the two *Parisini 8063, 8064.* The scholia enable us to form some idea of the individuality of Lactantius (e.g. traces of rhythmical *clausulae*, attention given to subject matter rather than grammatico-rhetorical points, interested in Philosophy; especially the *pars naturalis*). L. Havet, *Armatus, Bewaffnung.* No Ciceronian ex. in *Thesaurus*: but see *Cae. 61.* P. Rasi, *Vom Perfectform von *vomere*?* Evidence for *euomissus* in *Carmen de Pascha* 52 H, supporting *vomerit* in *Fronto* p. 141 n. K. E. Götz, *Waren die Römer blaublind?* (continued from vol. 14). Discusses *caeruleus*, *aerius*, *thalassicus*, *venetus*, *caesius*, *liuidus*, *glaucus*, *cyanus*, *hyacinthinus*. The Romans had a perfectly clear conception of the colour. W. Heraeus, *Obrio und obro.* Evidence from Chiron's *Mulomedicina*, etc. Idem, *Glanda.* In *Gell. iv. 8* *glandem* and *glande* of the MSS. may be a trace of this word (found thrice in verse). Idem, *Zur sogenannten Peregrinatio Silviae.* Emendations and stylistic notes: accusative for nom. (said by Mohl to be the surest characteristic of Spanish Latin) in 25. 3, 27. 1 (*orationem, septimanas, unum*), vulgarisms, redundancies. Idem, *Crep(atura).* *Crepertas* the reading in *Schol. Iuu. 3. 196.* Idem, *Uter, utris* *Iuuenlus 2. 373* *utribus.* Idem, *Der Akkusativ nach memor, nescius* and *Lacernobirrus.* The Editor, *Zu den lat. Spruchversen.* Influence of Euripides and Menander on Publius Syrus. Relation between him and 'Caecilius de nugis philosophorum.' C. Weyman, *Epikerfragment bei Seneca?* *Trag.* 4. 5 *stat tamen et clamore iuuat.* *Miscellen:* W. Heraeus, *Congustus.* Traces of this adj. e.g. in the poem of the Anthology 'De balneis cuiusdam pauperibus.' M. Pokrowskij, *Spätlateinisches.* Notes on the *Thesaurus Glossarum*

Emendatarum.
Cumque = quando
Honoriūs ist (6
Lindsay's *Synta*
ib. VII, I, Ihm
F. Buecheler.

Mnemosyne

S. A. Naber
and minor, Ion
rat. aud. 38 B:
(contd. from vol.
it introduces in
exiles, who co
keeping of defi
office became a
De Euripideas
of the new ve
cap. ex. inim.
onecturiae in
Samia.

36. 4. 1908.

P. H. Da
of Bks. 1-6: e
II 135 (impu
665 (solem rad
fros) and con
IV 75, 410, V
'Hλον so that
C. Brakman,
pro Sulla, pro
Natulæ ad alt
on Epitrepont
sacc. VI et V
Aristoph.) diffi
have not yet
J. J. H., Ad
S. A. Naber,

37. 1. 1

S. A. Naber
(p. 515 E to e
Quaestiones G
Plutarchus. I
8 iv oīs, rō vī
Comici fragm
vol. 36). No
iōvāpābāw a
vol. 36). 7.
(p. 7. 481,

er Zeit von
nes, the life
Erhellung.
litarius, not
solitarius, in
Vorschlag
difficulties
treaty made
Zielinski's
Grünwald.

am, mainly
ba humilia,
594, 455.
atrium redi
seen before;
the case of
de, tmesis
sloß, Ueber
proinde is
anged. In
sage wants
usual force.
reason to
A. Klotz,
In view,
rd. Idem,
about 400.
asted until
again were
d the two
iduality of
ter rather
naturalis.
Caec. 61.
scha 52 H,
blaublind?
caesius,
conception
ticina, etc.
ace of this
emendations
characteristic of
undancies.
Iter, utris
ernobirrus.
Publilius
Weyman,
Miscellen:
De balneis
Glossarum

Emendatarum. C. Weyman, *Eualere.* Occurs in Vincentius of Lerinum. *Idem, Cumque=quandocumque.* In conn. with Hor. O. 1. 32, quotes an inscription of Pope Honorius 1st (625-638) where *cumque uelit=quandocumque uolet.* *Literatur, 1907-1908:* Lindsay's *Syntax of Plautus*, Peterson's *Verrinae*, Gercke's *Senecae naturalium quaest.* *ib. VIII*, Ihm's *Suetoni opera Vol. I* and other books are noticed. *Nekrolog:* F. Buecheler. *Mitteilung der Redaktion.* This is the last number of the *Archiv.*

Mnemosyne. 36. 3. 1908.

S. A. Naber, *Platonica* (contd.). Euthydemus, Protag., Gorg., Meno, Hipp. maior and minor, Ion, Menexenus, Clitophon, Republic. J. J. H., *Ad Plutarchum.* De rect. rat. aud. 38 B: read προηχανύσθος for προνύμενος. I. M. J. Valeton, *Quaest. Graecae* (contd. from vol. 16). The Lygdamis inscription of Halicarnassus. Nature of the changes it introduces in the matter of property-disputes: it is evidently directed against the exiles, who could not return within the year and a half mentioned therein. The keeping of definite records must have become a duty of the mnemones as soon as their office became an annual one. Restoration etc. of part of the inscription. K. Kuiper, *De Euripideae fabulæ Pirithoi fragmento nuper reperto.* Shews the Euripidean character of the new verses given in *Rhein. Mus.* 63, p. 145. J. J. H., *Ad Plutarchum.* De cap. ex. inim. util. 92 B. Read περιστέλλων for περίεστον. H. van Herwerden, *Nouae conjecturae in fragm. Menandrea reperta a Lefeburio.* Epitrepones, Perikeiromene, Samia.

36. 4. 1908.

P. H. Damsté, *Adn. ad Stati Thebaidem.* Emendations and defence of the text of Bks. 1-6: e.g. defence of I 87 (*modo digna ueni*), 517 (*ostro tenuis auroque sonantis*), II 135 (*impulerat*), 721 (*deuertis*), III 379 (*auditusque iterum*), IV 109 (*agrescunt*), 665 (*solem radis ignescere ferri*), V 30 (*artis toris*), 574 (*peregit*), 692 (*alit*), VI 25 (*labori feris*) and conjectures on II 71 (note on Statius' love for *totus*), III 217, 234, 314, IV 75, 410, VI 53, 79-83, 544. J. J. H., *Ad Plutarchum.* In Quom. adol. 19 F omit 'Ηλον so that πρύνειν means 'significare'; in *De lib. educ.* 10 F read θείων for θεών. C. Brakman, *Ad schol. Bobiensis.* Conjectures (affecting mainly notes on Verrines, pro Sulla, pro Sest, pro Flacc, pro Mil, pro Planc, pro Arch.). H. van Herwerden, *Notulae ad alteram Leeuwenii ed. fragmentorum Menandrorum recens detectorum.* Mainly on Epitrepones and Perikeiromene. K. Kuiper, *De vocab. τρόπος ui atque usu per sacc. VI et V.* The older usage (Pindar, Aeschylus, Sophocles). The later (Herod—Aristoph.) differs mainly in its tendency to make the word equivalent to ηθος, but they have not yet got as far as the έκάστη τὸν τρόπον συνίμοσαν φρούραρχον of Menander. J. J. H., *Ad Plutarchum.* In Praec. reip. ger. 820 A read τίμημα for τιμῆν ἄμα. S. A. Naber, *Platonica* (from part 3). Emendations of Rep. III-VI.

37. 1. 1909.

S. A. Naber, *Platonica* (continued from vol. 36). Emendations, etc., on Republic (p. 515 E to end), Timaeus, Critias, Minos, Laws, *Epistulae*, Scholia. J. M. J. Valeton, *Quaestiones Graecae.* III *De Inscr. Lygdamensi* (continued from vol. 36). J. J. H., *Plutarchus.* In *De lib. educ.* p. 10 A put a long stop after καλόν, and then read ἡτι θ' iv ol̄, τὸν νικᾶν βλαβερὸν καὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς νικη Καθειά. J. van Leeuwen, *Ad Aristophanis Comici fragmenta nuper reperta.* C. Brakman, *Ad Apulei Apologiam* (continued from vol. 36). Notes and emendations. J. J. H., *Plutarchus.* In *De lib. educ.* 8 A eject πνεομαθάν and read τοῖν for ὄντοι. P. H. Damsté, *Adn. ad Stati Thebaidem* (from vol. 36). 7. 1 atque ita, 98 lugenti 'quod praeda sibi eripitur,' 134 pectore right (cp. 7. 481, 9. 89, 151, 12. 606), 308 calentem, 338 incidere right (cp. 11. 255,

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

Ach. 2. 136), 634 *scit fessa manus* (cp. 7. 792), 798 *alias right* (cp. 804 sqq. *mors alia*). 8. 147-8: *reliqui* (taking *rector* as vocative), 154 *more right*. 9. 183 *nunc iam*, 218 *au fulmine*, 419 *unaque genus*, 625 *natum*, 747 *efflat faucibus*, 865 *telis dextramque*. 10. 26 *rapti* (for *nigri*), 295 *animas*, 441 *interea uetus*, 743 *agit furias*, 916 *aut iterum*. 11. 242 sqq. The first six lines alone belong to the *nuntius*, 529 *rumpant*. 12. 5 *raris* = 'left empty,' 430 *renuere*, 547 *semina* right (cp. *Ach.* 2. 89, *Theb.* 4. 212, etc.). J. J. H. *Plutarchus*. In *Præc. reip. ger.* 803 c insert *σκόπτειν* after *κατάρχοντα*, 816 A delete *καὶ* before *ἀρχοντα* or read for it *τὸν*, 824 c delete *εὐχόμενος*. H. v. H. *Tentant duo loci ex A. Klottii dissertatione 'Zwei neue Blätter des Perikeironene'* J. van Leeuwen, *Ad Menandrum*. Notes on Her. 45, Disc. 168, 192, 455, 451, 494. Circumst. 75, 186, Sam. 18, 102, 232. Traces iambics in Plutarch's *σύγχρονος* of Aristophanes and Menander and believes he had before him a metrical composition. v. L., *Ad Aristoph. Vesp.* 1179. Photius s.v. *ἀνθρωπικὸς μῆθος* to be emended: *ἀνθρ. μῆθος*] ὁ περὶ ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων ἔχων τὴν ὑπόθεσιν. *Ἀριστοφάνης* [Σφῆγειν. ἀνθρωπίσεται] *Ἀριστοφάνης* *Ἀμφισβητία*.

Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie. 1908.

4 Sept. E. Drerup, ['Ηρόδον] περὶ πολιτείας (G. J. Schneider), favourable. J. May, *Rhythmische Analyse der Rede Ciceros pro S. Roscio Amerino* (W. Kroll). Volkmann, *Die Harmonie der Sphären in Ciceros Traum des Scipio* (M. Manitius). 'A sound investigation.' G. Pierleoni, *L'allitterazione nell' astronomico di Manilio* (H. Kleingünther), favourable. *Poematici latini relli. ex vol. Herculaniensi evulgatis denuo ru.* I. Ferrara (M. Manitius). 'May almost be regarded as definitive.' A. Engeli, *Die Oratio variata bei Pausanias* (A. Thumb), favourable. W. Kunzmann, *Quaestiones de Pseudo-Luciani libelli qui est de Longarivis fontibus atque auctoritate* (P. Schulze). 'Shows diligence but does not further the investigation.' A. Merlin, *Rapport sur les inscriptions latines de la Tunisie* (M. J.). *Ausonia*, Rivista della società italiana di archeologia. I. Jahrgang (J. Ziehen).

11 Sept. D. Baud-Bovy et Fr. Boissonnas, *En Grèce par monts et par vaux*. Avec des notices archéologiques par G. Nicole et une préface par Th. Homolle (A. Trendelenburg), very favourable. W. Brachmann, *Die Gebärde bei Homer* (Chr. Harder). 'Answers a real need.' Sophocles, *The Trachiniae*, abridged from Jebb's larger edition by G. A. Davies (H. Steinberg), favourable. G. Modugno, *Il concetto della vita nella filosofia greca* (J. Ziehen), favourable on the whole. Manilius, *Astronomica*, herausg. von Th. Breiter. II. *Kommentar* (M. Manitius). 'Fills a great gap.'

18 Sept. G. Nicole, *Meidias et le style fleuri dans la drame attique* (A. Trendelenburg), favourable. R. Thiele, *Im ionischen Kleinasien* (G. Lang), favourable. O. Fritsch, *Delos*, and O. Fritsch, *Delphi* (G. Lang). 'Interesting to advanced schoolboys.' Cicero, *Brutus*, erkl. von O. Jahn. 5. Aufl. von W. Kroll (H. Steinberg). *Horatius*, herausg. von O. Keller und J. Häussner. 3 Aufl. (H. Belling), favourable.

25 Sept. E. Wittich, *Homer in seinen Bildern und Vergleichungen* (H. Draheim), favourable. N. Pavlatos, *Η πατρὶς τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως* (P. Goessler), unfavourable. Th. Wagner, *Symbolarum ad comicorum Graecorum historiam criticam capita quattuor* (Fr. Spiro), very favourable. E. Breccia, *Il diritto dinastico nelle monarchie dei successori d'Alessandro Magno* (Fr. Cauer). 'A careful and thorough investigation.' M. Niedermann und E. Hermann, *Historische Lautlehre der Lateinischen* (Bartholomae). 'To be recommended to all concerned with Latin grammar.'

2 Oct. J. Partsch, *Das Alter der Inselnatur von Leukas* (P. Goessler), favourable. M. V. Williams, *Six essays on the Platonic theory of Knowledge* (G. Lehnert). 'A welcome introduction to the problems of Plato.' L. Venturini, *Tarquinio il Superbo* (Fr. Cauer). 'Arbitrary and subjective, and so not convincing.'

9 Oct. J. Vürtheim, *De Aiacis origine, cultu, patria; accedit commentationes tres de*

Amazonibus, a *Parthenon* (H. opera, rec. T. edition of the E. favourable. R. A. v. P. Koenen).

16 Oct.

Hennings), fav Schiche. 2 A gemäde von reality.'

23 Oct.

Anthropologie the classical G II. (Th. Star A. Hartmann).

30 Oct.

Die Kausalsä thanks N. thoroughness Glotta Zeits und Fr. Sku American Sch Egbert, A. W. Beck (M. Wartenberg),

6 Nov.

the assistance Materialien zu L. Mitteis, A. und Lehre vo Apologie des L

13 Nov.

7. Aufl. (Fr. Demostenis a M. Barone, S. Fr. Reisch, favourable. Grundbegriffe

20 Nov.

(O. Kern).

(O. Kern). Syntax des g Gedichte, erkl von P. Deutic able. *Persi*

27 Nov. Arndt, *Das Philosophie (topicorum lib*

Amazonibus, de Carneis, de Telegonia (H. Steuding), favourable. C. Kukula, *Alkmans Parthenion* (H. St.). H. Wolf, *Die Religion der alten Römer* (H. St.), favourable. *Homeri opera*, rec. T. W. Allen. Tom. III, IV (P. Cauer). 'Has not made a step beyond his edition of the Iliad.' G. Rudberg, *Textstudien zur Tiergeschichte des Aristoteles* (M. Manitius), favourable. R. Bloch, *De Pseudo-Luciani amoribus* (A. Bonhöffer). 'A sound contribution.' A. v. Premerstein, *Das Attentat der Konsulare auf Hadrian im Jahre 118* (Köhler), favourable. *The Loeb Collection of Arretine Pottery, catalogued by G. H. Chase* (C. Koenen).

16 Oct. H. Schiller, *Beiträge zur Wiederherstellung der Odyssee*. II. (P. D. Ch. Hennings), favourable. *Ciceronis Tusculanarum disputationum libri V*, herausg. von Th. Schiche. 2 Aufl. (H. Steinberg). M. Siebourg, *Akropolis und Forum Romanum*. Wandgemälde von M. Roeder (Köhler). 'Do not fulfil their principal object—to represent reality.'

23 Oct. E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*. 2. Aufl. I. 1. *Einleitung, Elemente der Anthropologie* (Fr. Cauer), favourable. K. Rees, *The [so-called] rule of three actors in the classical Greek drama* (F. Adami), very favourable. J. Vahleni, *Opuscula academicia*. II. (Th. Stangl). E. Stroebel, *Tulliana*. On the *de Inventione*. 'Very useful work.' A. Hartmann, *De inventione Juvenalis capita tria* (H. Blümner), favourable.

30 Oct. A. Fairbanks, *Athenian Lekythoi* (H. L. Ulrichs), favourable. M. Nilsson, *Die Kausalsätze im Griechischen bis Aristoteles* (Helbing). 'Learned and deserving of thanks.' N. Terzaghi, *Appunti sui paragoni nei tragici Greci* (Helbing). 'Shows thoroughness and diligence.' E. Krause, *Diogenes von Apollonia* (G. Lehner), favourable. *Glotta. Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache*, herausg. von P. Kretschmer und Fr. Skutsch. I, 2/3 (R. Meister), very favourable. *Supplementary Papers of the American School of classical studies in Rome*. II. By G. H. Allen, Ch. D. Curtis, J. C. Egbert, A. W. van Buren (Th. Stangl). Ekkehard's *Waltharius*. Ein Kommentar von W. Beck (M. Manitius), favourable. D. Aiginetes, *Tò κλίμα τῆς Ἀττικῆς*. I. II. (G. Wartenberg), favourable.

6 Nov. *The Tebtunis papyri*. Part II. ed. by B. S. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, with the assistance of E. J. Goodspeed (A. Stein). 'A new and priceless gift.' Fr. Helm, *Materialien zur Herodoteküte* (W. Gemoll). 'To be recommended to all students.' L. Mitteis, *Römisches Privatrecht bis auf die Zeit Diokletians*. Band I. *Grundbegriffe und Lehre von den juristischen Personen* (E. Grupe) I. A. Müller, *Zur Überlieferung der Apologie des Firmicus Maternus* (J. Dräseke), favourable.

13 Nov. W. Luckenbach, *Kunst und Geschichte*. I. *Abbildungen zur alten Geschichte*. 7. Aufl. (Fr. Harder), favourable. K. Witte, *Quaestiones tragicae* (F. Adami), favourable. *Demosthenis orationes*, rec. S. H. Butcher. I. II. (May). 'Does not show much progress.' M. Barone, *Sull' uso dell' Aorito nel ἡρῷον τοῦ ἀνθεορέως* (Isocrate) (Helbing), favourable. Fr. Reisch, *De adiectivis Graecis in ὡς motionis Graecae linguae specimen* (Helbing) favourable. L. Mitteis, *Römisches Privatrecht bis auf die Zeit Diokletians*. Band I. *Grundbegriffe und Lehre von den juristischen Personen* (E. Grupe), II, very favourable.

20 Nov. *Briefwechsel zwischen A. Böckh und L. Dissen*, herausg. von M. Hoffmann (O. Kern). *Imagines inscriptionum graecarum antiquissimarum*, tert. ed. H. Roehl (O. Kern). 'The third edition shows a great advance.' J. M. Stahl, *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit* (Helbing) very favourable. *Vergils Gedichte*, erkl. von Th. Ludwig und C. Schaper. I. *Bukolika und Georgika*. 8. Aufl. von P. Deuticke (F. Skutsch), favourable. F. Keppler *Über Copia* (F. Skutsch), unfavourable. *Persi et juvenalis saturae*, rec. S. G. Owen. Ed. alt. (J. Ziehen), favourable.

27 Nov. *Euripide, les Bachantes*, par G. Dalmeida (K. Busche), favourable. E. Arndt, *Das Verhältnis der Verstandeserkenntnis zur sinnlichen in der vorsokratischen Philosophie* (A. Döring). 'A serious and careful piece of work.' J. Pflug, *De Aristotelis topicorum libro V*. (G. Lehner), favourable. G. Gundel, *De stellarum appellatione et*

religione Romana (J. Moeller). 'Deserves approval.' A. Welzel, *De Claudiani et Corippi sermone epico* (M. Manitius), favourable. *Pseudo-Augustini Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, rec. A. Souter (C. Weyman), favourable. *Augustini scripta contra Donatistas*. Pars I. rec. M. Petschenig (C. Weyman), favourable.

4 Dec. F. Emlein, *De locis quos ex Ciceronis orationibus in Institutionis oratoria XII. libris laudavit Quintilianus* (May), favourable. J. Cornu, *Beiträge zur lateinischen Metrik* (H. Draheim), unfavourable on the whole. Guil. Noetzel, *De archaismis qui apud veteres Romanorum poetas scaenicos inveniuntur in finibus aut versuum aut colorum in iambum exeuuntum* (H. Draheim), favourable. P. J. M. Pfäffisch, *Die Rede Konstantius d. Gr. an die Versammlung der Heiligen*, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht (J. Dräseke), favourable. N. E. Griffin, *Dares und Dictys* (J. Dräseke), unfavourable.

11 Dec. P. Friedländer, *Herakles* (H. Steuding). 'Stimulating but not reliable.' Aeschylus, *Agamemnon. The choral odes and lyric scenes set to music* by J. E. Lodge (A. Thierfelder), unfavourable. E. Graf, *Der Kampf um die Musik im griechischen Altertum* (A. Thierfelder), favourable. Plato, *Apology*, ed. by H. Williamson (D.), favourable. Virgil's *Aeneid*, Books I.-VI. by R. Fairclough and L. Brown (D.), favourable. F. O. Norton, *A lexicographical and historical study of Διαβήτης* (J. Dräseke), favourable.

18 Dec. B. Knös, *Codex Graecus XV. Upsaliensis* (K. Busche). 'A valuable contribution.' J. Burnet, *Early Greek philosophy*, 2 ed. (W. Nestle), very favourable. E. Galli, *Per la Sibaritide* (H. Nissen), unfavourable. G. Napoletani, *Fermo nel Piceno* (H. Nissen), favourable. C. Dubois, *Pouzzoles antique* (H. Nissen), very favourable. A. Elter, *Itinerarstudien. I. II.* (Köhler), favourable. A. Naegle, *Chrysostomos und Libanios* (J. Dräseke), very favourable.

25 Dec. Th. Sinko, *Annotationes ad Euripidis Bacchae* (K. Busche), unfavourable. Fr. Isler, *Quaestiones metricae* (D.). On the paragogic *nu* in Homer and other poets. P. Barth, *Die Stoa*. 2. Aufl. (A. Bonhöffer), very favourable. R. Faust, *De Lucani orationibus. I. II.* (R. Helm), favourable. L. Weigl, *Johannes Kamateros Εἰραγῆς ἀττικούς* (J. Dräseke), favourable.

1909.

4 Jan. H. F. Hitzig, *Altgriechische Staatsverträge über Rechtshilfe* (Fr. Cauer), favourable. W. Nestle, *Herodots Verhältnis zur Philosophie und Sophistik* (W. Gemoll). 'Shows learning and judgment.' J. N. Svoronos, *Tὰ νομίμων τὸν κράτον τὸν Πτολεμαῖον*. IV (H. v. Fritze), favourable. J. Sundwall, *Untersuchungen über die attischen Münzen des neueren Stiles* (K. Regling), favourable. K. Schneider, *Die griechischen Gymnasien und Palästra* (J. Ziehen). 'Shows great diligence and generally sound judgment.' A. Struck, *Makedonische Fährten. I. II.* (G. Wartenberg), favourable. Terence, *The comedies*, by S. G. Ashmore (P. Wessner), unfavourable. P. Mihaleanu, *De comprehensionibus relativis opus Ciceronem* (E. A. Gutjahr-Probst), favourable. A. Loercher, *De compositione et fonte libri Ciceronis qui est de fato* (A. Bonhöffer). 'A valuable contribution to the problem.' G. Zottoli, *Litus Pompeianus* (H. D.). On an inscr. of Pompeii. H. Zwicker, *Wie studiert man klassische Philologie?* (J. Ziehen), favourable.

11 Jan. F. Schulte, *Archytæ qui serebantur de notionibus universalibus et de oppositis libellorum reliquias* (A. Bonhöffer). 'A sound piece of work.' H. Schmidt, *De Hermino Peripateticō* (A. Bonhöffer), unfavourable. O. Kolthaus, *Plutarchi de communibus notitiis librum genuinum esse demonstratur* (A. Bonhöffer), very favourable. W. Tschajkanovitsch, *Quaestiorum paroemiographicarum capita selecta* (W. Gemoll), favourable. F. Jobst, *Über das Verhältnis von Lucretius und Empedokles* (W. Nestle). 'A useful contribution.' T. Fitzhugh, *Prolegomena to the history of Italo-Romanic rhythm* (H. G.), favourable. T. Steinwender, *Ursprung und Entwicklung des Manipularsystems* (R. Oehler), very favourable. T. A. Abele, *Der Senat unter Augustus* (W. Soltau). 'A useful collection of material.' H. Ziemer, *Aus dem Reiche der Psychologie* (O. Weise), favourable.

18 Jan. whole. M. C. die 21. *Rede* d.

25 Jan.

III. Greek and University A. inscriptions.

Part I. by W. pertinentium c.

direction of P. von U. Thiem and *Algebra* (et *Latinus* phot.

America.

1. W. B. D. True kn. Fergusson, a. and elem. A useful bib.

2. J. B. Cart. Topograph. Servian City and by the

3. L. D. Cas. Discusses a projecting

4. O. M. Wa. Supports p. 151), criti

5. Archaeolo. 6. Bibliogr.

Part 3. 1. G. H. Cha. seven cuts.)

Three tri. mythological are Ionic G. Etruscan im-

2. Esther B. The major Vestal statu-

3. B. W. Rob. One is of places and o-

4. Archaeolog.

iani et Corippi
eteris et Novi
tra Donatistas.

tionis oratoria
ur lateinischen
ismis qui apud
rum in iambum
tius d. Gr. an
(e), favourable.

not reliable.
E. Lodge (A.
schen Altertum
(.), favourable.
urable. F. O.
urable.

'A valuable
ery favourable.
mo nel Piceno
ery favourable.
ysostomos und
unfavourable.
d other poets.
, De Lucani
ros Euraygyn

(Fr. Cauer),
(W. Gemoll).
n Πτολεμαῖον.
schen Münzen
en Gymnasien
nd judgment'
, The comedies,
sprehensionibus
e compositione
bution to the
H. Zwicker,

et de oppositis
, De Hermino
unibus notitiae
hajkanovitsch.
F. Jobst, Über
tribution.' T.
avourable. T.
, very favour
collection of
le.

18 Jan. F. Bechtel, *Die Vokalcontraction bei Homer* (P. Cauer), favourable on the whole. M. Carroll, *The Attica of Pausanias* (A. Trendelenburg), favourable. Knappe, *Ist die 21. Rede des Gaudentius echt?* (J. Dräseke). 'A worthy contribution.'

25 Jan. *Publications of an American Archaeological Expedition to Syria in 1899-1900.* III. *Greek and Latin inscriptions* by W. K. Prentice, and *Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expedition to Syria in 1904-1906.* III. *Greek and Latin inscriptions*. Sec. A: *Southern Syria*, by E. Littmann. Part I. Sec. B: *Northern Syria*. Part I. by W. K. Prentice (W. Larfeld). G. Thieme, *Quæstionum comicarum ad Periclem pertinentium capitula III* (Schneider), rather unfavourable. *Papyrus Grecs*, publiés sous la direction de P. Jonguet (C. Wessely). *Allgemeines Lexikon der bildenden Künstler*, herausg. von U. Thieme und F. Becker. II. (A. Brückner), favourable. A. v. Velics, *Onomatopöie und Algebra* (O. Weise), very unfavourable. A. W. Sijthoff, *Unternehmen der Codices Graeci et Latini photographice depicti* (G. Andresen), very favourable.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL.

American Journal of Archaeology. 1908. Part 2.

1. W. B. Dinsmore: The Mausoleum at Halicarnassos. II. (Three plates, four cuts.) True knowledge of the design to be attained by following R. M. Smith, Pullan, Fergusson, and Adler; in addition, the knowledge of the exact dimensions of members and elements of design, shews how Pythios followed certain principles of proportion. A useful bibliography of ancient and modern descriptions is appended.

2. J. B. Carter: *Roma Quadrata* and the *Septimontium*.

Topographical methods of study of Rome must be corrected by historical. That the Servian City was preceded by a City of Four Regions is shewn by the Calendar of Numa and by the Pomoerium within the Servian wall. Apart from and earlier than this, there is no evidence of *Roma Quadrata* or the *Septimontium*.

3. L. D. Caskey and B. H. Hill: The 'Metopon' in the Erechtheum. (Eight cuts.)

Discusses an inscription in *Brit. Mus.* (I.G. i. 322). The *mérwπον* (col. 1, line 30) was a projecting interior partition at the S.W. corner.

4. O. M. Washburn: The Charioteer of Amphion at Delphi. (Cut.)

Supports the Cyrenaic origin of the monument against the Syracusan (cf. *A.J.A.* 1906, p. 151), criticising chiefly the views of Pomtow.

5. Archaeological Discussions, ed. J. M. Paton.

6. Bibliography, 1907.

Part 3.

1. G. H. Chase: Three bronze Tripods belonging to James Loeb, Esq. (Eleven plates, seven cuts.)

Three tripods from Perugia, reconstructed by Hoffmann of Boston, all with various mythological subjects (Bellerophon, Perseus, etc.). They date from about 550 B.C., and are Ionic Greek work, whereas the similar bronze and silver reliefs from Perugia are Etruscan imitations.

2. Esther B. van Deman: The value of the Vestal Statues as originals. (Seventeen cuts.)

The majority not portraits but 'shop-copies' of well-known types; not important as Vestal statues, except where portrait heads have been attached.

3. B. W. Robinson: Two new inscriptions from Beersheba. (Two cuts.)

One is of the fourth century; the other, an imperial edict regulating the yearly tax of places and officials in South Palestine.

4. Archaeological News, Jan.-June 1908, ed. W. N. Bates.

Jahrbuch des deutschen arch. Instituts. xxiii. 1908. Heft 1.

1. T. Wiegand: The Hippodrome of Constantinople in the time of Suleiman the Great. (Plate, two cuts.) Discusses latest evidence for its appearance before 1516, as given by an artist and an architect; the former incorrect in some points; attempts a reconstruction of the colonnade on these lines.

2. E. Petersen: Gleanings in Athens. (Three cuts.) (1) The Pyrgos and Nike-temple contemporary with the Propylaea. (2) Exact position of Artemis-Hekate, Hermes, Charites, and Chalkothekene on Acropolis discussed. (3) Criticism of Dörpfeld's views on Hellenistic *skene* of theatre.

3. R. Zahn: Hellenistic relief-vases from South Russia. (Forty-nine cuts.) Describes thirty-seven examples from Vogel collection, mostly of the 'Megarian' bowl type.

Anzeiger. (1) Notice of A. Kirchhoff's death. (2) Excavations at Lachish (H. Thiersch; nineteen cuts). (3) Miscellanea (Petersen). (4) Meeting of Berlin Arch. Gesellschaft, Nov. 1907. (5) Bibliography.

Heft 2.

1. G. Kropatschek: Pestles and *Pila muralia*. (Plate; fourteen cuts.) Discusses wooden implements, obviously weapons, found in camp at Oberaden, Lippe; similar to pestles used as weapons in Greek vase-scenes (e.g. Brygos' *Iliupersis*). Since *pilum*=Gk. *ὑπέρον*, these are probably *pila muralia*, used in emergencies as weapons of defence.

2. E. Pernice: Diskos-throwing. (Three cuts.) Deals with Gardiner's paper in *J.H.S.* xxvii., and discusses movement of legs in throwing.

3. B. Sauer: Nike in the Parthenon Pediments. (Cut.) Criticises C. Smith's theory (*J.H.S.* xxvii.); Nike impossible in West Pediment, improbable in East.

4. E. Pernice: The Tripod from the Isis-temple at Pompeii. (Four cuts.) Bronze tripod in Naples Museum, probably from Herculaneum, has been botched up in ancient times.

5. T. Birt: Addenda to *Buchrolle in der Kunst*. Discusses Pfuhl's corrections and additions in *Jahrb.* xxii., p. 113.

Anzeiger. (1) Annual report of Arch. Inst. (2) Finds in 1907 (Europe, except Britain; Asia; Africa). (3) Bibliography.

Athenische Mittheilungen. Vol. XXIII. Heft 1-2. 1908.

1. A. Prandtl: Fragments of the Parthenon Pediments. (Four plates; four cuts.) Identifies seven fragments in Acropolis Museum with pediment-figures: foot of 'Prometheus'; drapery and left hand of Zeus; torso of Erysichthon and head of Athena (W.); fragments of wings from both.

2. A. Frickenhaus: Statue of Athena in the Old Temple at Athens. (Four cuts.) Not a 'Palladion' type, which was introduced by Peisistratos, but an older seated type with libation-bowl, for which there is evidence in vases, terra-cottas, and inscriptions.

3. F. Noad: Walls s. 4. C. Fred. Notes o. 5. E. Nach. Two in a stele no. 6. G. Karo. Dates t. but with a. 7. H. Latte. Addition. 8. C. Fred. Descript. 9. R. Page. Published next to the 250 B.C. 10. P. Groeb. Published from Perga. 11. U. von. Criticises Archidamia its success. 12. T. Wieg. Thirty-on. 13. F. Hiller. Established. 14. Id.: Amp. Deals wi. 15. K. Kur. A head characterist. 16. A. Frickenhaus. Erechtheion. the Brygos child is a. 17. K. Rhom. The first form not li. are certain. 18. W. Dörpfeld. The new pre-historic metal objects. 19. A. Brückner. A final e. burials in th.

3. F. Noack: Remarks on the Walls of Peiraeus.
Walls shown to belong to fourth century.
4. C. Fredrich: From Philippi and Neighbourhood. (Two cuts.)
Notes on inscriptions.
5. E. Nachmanson: Pre-Greek Inscriptions from Lemnos. (Plate and cut.)
Two inscriptions in alphabet resembling old Phrygian, but non-Greek language, on a stele now at Athens; reading discussed.
6. G. Karo: The Tyrsean Stele from Lemnos. (Seven cuts.)
Dates the above, by means of relief on stele, as sixth century; style un-Greek, but with affinities to early Etruscan; assigned to Tyrseanians.
7. H. Lattermann: The Architectural Inscription from Athens. (Cut.)
Additional comments and suggestions on that published in *Ath. Mitt.* xxxi., p. 135.
8. C. Fredrich: Imbros. (32 cuts.)
Description of ancient sites, inscriptions, and antiquities (terra-cottas, pottery, coins).
9. R. Pagenstecher: The Athena Parthenos of Pheidias. (Four cuts.)
Publishes clay medallion from Athens, with head of this type; the earliest copy next to the Crimea gold relief; from the top of a Campanian *guttus* of about 300-250 B.C.
10. P. Groebe: Roman Honorary Inscriptions. (Cut.)
Publishes an Athenian inscription to Cn. Pompeius Strabo (89 B.C.), and three from Pergamon.
11. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf: Eleutherae.
Criticises *Ath. Mitt.* xxxii., p. 561 ff.; Eleutherae not made subject to Athens in Critidamian War; the Oinoe of Thucydides and Herodotus is really this place, or its successor Melainae.
12. T. Wiegand: Inscriptions from the Levant. (Three cuts.)
Thirty-one inscriptions from Constantinople and Asia Minor, mostly Greek.
13. F. Hiller von Gaertringen: Inscriptions of uncertain origin.
Establishes the origin of some previously published as from unknown sources.
14. *Id.*: Amphorae from Paphos.
Deals with six found in 1903, with names of eponymous priest, maker, and month.
15. K. Kuruniotis: Marble Head from Arcadia. (Plate, two cuts.)
A head found near Phigaleia, the only example of marble sculpture from Arcadia; characteristic treatment of hair; Egyptian influence visible.
16. A. Frickenhaus: Erechtheus.
Erechtheus was conceived as inhabiting the cista on the Acropolis in serpent-form (cf. the Brygos vase), and thus became the protecting serpent of Athena; the Erichthonios child is a later invention of the fifth century.
17. K. Rhomaios: Potters' Kilns in Kynuria. (Cut.)
The first discovery of a potter's kiln in Greece, belonging to the third century B.C.; form not like Roman, but as depicted on vases; hence those on the Corinthian pinakes are certainly potters' kilns.
18. W. Dörpfeld: Olympia in pre-historic times. (Four cuts.)
The new excavations support the writer's view of the early origin of Olympia; a pre-historic settlement found with remains of dwellings and primitive pottery, but no metal objects.
19. A. Brückner: Excavations at Agia Triada.
A final exploration of the site, made for a plan, has thrown fresh light on its use for burials in the fifth century.

Heft 3.

1. E. Nachmannson: *Inscriptions from Athens.* (Plate.)
Publishes list of treasurers of Athena for 349-8 B.C., the first of the kind known; also a unique dedication to the goddess Horme; and two others.
2. E. D. Keramopoulos: On *I.G.* vii. 2463 and 553.
3. C. Fredrich: *Thasos.* (Three plates, seven cuts.)
Topography and remains of the city of Thasos and other sites.
4. F. Versace: The Temple and Stoa in the Amphiaraeum at Oropus. (Four plates, seven cuts.)
A full description of buildings hitherto scantly published; the temple Doric prostyle, the stoa also Doric, with a chamber at each end for male and female devotees respectively to sleep in; both date about 390 B.C.
5. G. Kawerau: Tripod-stands from the Acropolis, Athens. (Three cuts.)
Some poros blocks found in 1885-90 not hitherto explained, shewn to be bases for tripods.
6. M. P. Nilsson: *Serpent-stele of Zeus Ktesios.* (Cut.)
Found at Thesiae; dedicatory inscription of third century; Zeus Ktesios a domestic god, sc. of the store-room, probably the same as Philios and Meilichios; originally conceived as a serpent; may be compared with Pompeian domestic shrines.
7. A. J. B. Wace and N. I. Giannopoulos: Communications from Thessaly.
Wace describes pre-historic settlements at Zerelia; Giannopoulos gives some additions to Thessaly volume of *Corpus* (*I.G.* ix. pt. 2).
8. W. Dörpfeld: Old Pylos. (Three plates, five cuts.)
Describes three beehive tombs discovered on the site of the Homeric Pylos, dating about 1500 B.C.
9. *Id.*: Pisa near Olympia.
Deals with discovery of pre-historic walls and tombs of the same period as those at Olympia (*v. supra*), confirming the traditional site of Pisa.
10. *Id.*: The Homeric town of Arene.
On the site of the later Samikon are remains of a pre-historic town (late Minoan II. period); this must be the Arene of *I.I. xi. 723.*
11. K. Müller: Temple of Artemis at Kombothekra.
Poros building of fifth century recently discovered near Pylos; shewn by dedicatory finds to have been a shrine of Artemis; these include primitive bronzes and terra-cottas, and late Greek vases.

Journal of Hellenic Studies. xxviii. 1908. Part 2.

1. J. P. Droop: Two Cyrenaic Kylikes. (Four cuts.)
2. A. W. Van Buren: Inscriptions from Asia Minor, Cyprus, and the Cyrenaica. (Two cuts.)
3. W. W. Tarn: The Fleet of Xerxes. (Map.)
4. W. Miller: The Marquisate of Boudonitzia. (Four cuts.)
5. L. Dyer: The Olympian Theatre and the Battle of Olympia.
6. F. H. Marshall: A Graeco-Roman Bronze Lamp. (Plate.)
7. W. M. Flinders Petrie: The Structure of Herodotus, Book II.
8. G. E. Underhill: Theopompos (or Cratipus), Hellenica.
9. A. M. Woodward: Some Unpublished Attic Inscriptions.
10. J. D. Beazley: Three New Vases in the Ashmolean Museum. (Three plates.)
11. R. M. Dawkins: Archaeology in Greece, 1907-08.
12. A. J. B. Wace: Topography of Pelion and Magnesia (Addenda).
13. D. G. Hogarth: The Archaic Artemisia.

Notices of Books, Rules, Proceedings, etc.

H. B. W.

known; also a

(Four plates,

Doric prostyle,
es respectively

o be bases for

ios a domestic
os; originally
nes.

ly.
ne additions to

Pylos, dating

od as those at

ate Minoan II.

by dedicatory
nd terra-cottas,

he Cyrenaica.

e plates.)

H. B. W.